

PUBLIC HEARING
DRAFT CMRR SEIS
CMRR AT TECHNICAL AREA 55 (LOS ALAMOS)
May 26, 2011
5:30 p.m.
Santa Fe Community College
6401 Richards Avenue
Main Building, Jemez Rooms
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Bruce MacAllister, JD, Public Hearing Facilitator
Mr. John Tegtmeier, CMRR SEIS Document Manager

REPORTED BY: Sally Peters, RPR, NM CCR 57
Mary Hankins, RPR, NM CCR 20
Bean & Associates, Inc.
Professional Court Reporting Service
201 Third Street, Northwest, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

(1127K) SP/MH

SANTA FE OFFICE
119 East Marcy, Suite 110
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 989-4949
FAX (505) 820-6349

**BEAN
& ASSOCIATES, Inc.**
PROFESSIONAL COURT
REPORTING SERVICE

MAIN OFFICE
201 Third NW, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 843-9494
FAX (505) 843-9492
1-800-669-9492
e-mail: info@litsupport.com

1 MR. MacALLISTER: Welcome everyone. My
2 name is Bruce MacAllister. I will be your
3 facilitator.

4 And before I introduce myself, let me
5 start by explaining where the emergency exits and
6 the facilities are. The primary exits for this room
7 are the two doorways in the back. If there is an
8 emergency and we need to vacate the building
9 quickly, there are double doors, two sets of double
10 doors that exit immediately onto a patio right off
11 this alcove. If for any reason those are blocked,
12 the exit through the main cafeteria area of the
13 community college will also be available. If for
14 any reason you have to use one of these exits up
15 here, you will exit through the door and make an
16 immediate right. You go down the hallway to your
17 right, and you will exit again to the right into the
18 hallway adjacent to the cafeteria.

19 So as far as drinking fountains, there are
20 drinking fountains out the rear doorway and to the
21 left on the wall. As you turn left and look left,
22 there will be drinking fountains. Restroom
23 facilities are multiple being a college campus, but
24 the closest ones, if you walk left past the food
25 services area that right now is closed and screened

1 off, there are men's and ladies' facilities just up
2 that hallway to the left. Alternatively there are
3 restrooms at the back end of the cafeteria, and
4 there are restrooms further down that hallway.

5 Again, as I mentioned, my name is Bruce
6 MacAllister. I am a self-employed small business
7 person doing mediation, community facilitation work,
8 and organizational development work through a small
9 business called Business Excellence Solutions.

10 I am not affiliated with Los Alamos
11 National Laboratory other than having a contract to
12 provide facilitation services. I'm not employed by
13 the Department of Energy, by the NNSA, or by any of
14 the major contractors to the Department of Energy,
15 other than as I mentioned, for purposes of my
16 facilitation contract.

17 Also our host tonight, I would like to
18 thank the Santa Fe Community College, but again, the
19 community college is not involved or taking any
20 official position one way or another with respect to
21 the issue that we are here to discuss.

22 The content of tonight's meeting is the
23 Los Alamos National Laboratory Chemical and
24 Metallurgy Research Replacement Facility. It's the
25 nuclear facility portion of that project that is

1 under review. The comments that we are soliciting
2 tonight have to do with the Supplemental
3 Environmental Impact Statement.

4 This public hearing is commenced under the
5 laws pertinent to the Environmental Impact
6 Statement.

7 Just a reminder, if you intend to speak
8 tonight, there will be sign-in cards at the table
9 just out your door to the left. They look like
10 this. These are the draft CMRR-NF SEIS comment
11 cards. You will be given a number, and as soon as
12 we roll into the comment period, we will be taking
13 your comments in the order of the sign-in, in the
14 order in which you signed in.

15 If there are elected officials from
16 federal, state, local, or tribal entities here, I
17 will be asking them for comments first, if there are
18 people here that choose to comment. And before we
19 have the comments, we will have about a 15 minute
20 presentation.

21 I would like to introduce at this point
22 the document manager for the project, John
23 Tegtmeier. John is the official hearing
24 representative for the meeting. Sometimes it's been
25 my impression in the previous meetings, that because

1 I am facilitating, people believe I am the person
2 they need to speak with. Let me assure you there
3 are times when I'm not even listening, because I am
4 focused on running the logistics of the meeting. So
5 the official that you need to be addressing comments
6 to is Mr. Tegtmeier.

7 The comments will be transcribed, and I
8 will be going through the ground rules for giving
9 comments in a few minutes.

10 Again the focus for this hearing is on
11 receiving comments relative to the Environmental
12 Impact Statement. We are not here to debate or
13 answer questions about larger questions of national
14 nuclear policy. Those decisions are made by
15 entities beyond those that are represented in this
16 meeting. So we would request that you understand
17 that the comments that are going to be most relevant
18 to us will be those comments relating to the project
19 at hand.

20 We will be timing the comment time to
21 ensure that everybody has an opportunity to speak.
22 Based on the number of people that have signed up so
23 far, it looks like we will be fine allowing people
24 up to five minutes to speak. I will explain more
25 ground rules about that after the presentation.

1 May I remind you, there is a poster
2 session that's going on outside. You are free at
3 any time, if a question surfaces that you want
4 technical information concerning, to return to the
5 poster area, and there will be subject matter
6 experts in that area available to answer technical
7 questions relating to the project. The purpose of
8 this session is not a question and answer session.

9 This session is to hear. The officials
10 are here to listen to your comments and to receive
11 those comments officially into a transcribed record.

12 If we run out of time tonight, there are
13 many other avenues to give comments. This is the
14 last of the officially scheduled formal hearings,
15 but there are nine other avenues for you to give
16 comments. There is a kiosk set up at the back,
17 looking at this direction as you exit the doorway,
18 the back left-hand side of the alcove out there, set
19 up with work stations to enter into a computer your
20 comments, to record comments directly in the system.
21 There is also a court reporter out there available
22 to take your transcribed statement. You can e-mail,
23 you can mail, you can fax, and there is a toll free
24 phone line.

25 Now, unlike the meeting, the recorded

1 session here which has time limits, all of these
2 other options are available without a time limit.
3 So those will be available to you.

4 As I mentioned earlier, I will as soon as
5 we have finished with the presentation, revisit some
6 of the other ground rules before opening up the
7 session for comments. But at this point, I would
8 like to introduce Mr. John Tegtmeier who is the
9 document custodian, the document manager for the
10 project that we are here to discuss. Thank you.

11 MR. TEGTMEIER: Thank you, Bruce.

12 Good evening. I appreciate everyone
13 coming. It's very important that we obtain public
14 input on the draft document that we have out for
15 review. My name is John Tegtmeier, as Bruce
16 mentioned. I work for the National Nuclear Security
17 Administration, Los Alamos Site Office. I am the
18 document manager, and I have many responsibilities,
19 so I would like to share with you very briefly with
20 that.

21 I have a responsibility for the
22 preparation of the document, that the document meets
23 the requirements of the National Environmental
24 Policy Act from the Council of Environmental
25 Quality, as well as the DOE implementing

1 requirements that are also federal law, but I
2 believe my most important role is to encourage and
3 facilitate public participation in this process.
4 It's very important to me, and I take that very
5 seriously.

6 So I would like to start with a little bit
7 of background on the environmental impact background
8 of this project. Back in 2003, an Environmental
9 Impact Statement was prepared for the project, and
10 it was followed by a Record of Decision in February
11 of 2004. In that decision, an approval was made for
12 a two building concept sited at Technical Area 55 at
13 Los Alamos that's adjacent to the existing plutonium
14 facility.

15 The first building is complete. That's
16 the Radiological/Laboratory/Utility/Office Building.
17 It is currently being outfitted, No. 1, for the
18 office space and training facilities for the
19 workers, and the second piece is the outfitting of
20 the laboratory space for the radiological laboratory
21 in that facility, and those laboratories deal with
22 very small quantities of material. So that's
23 happening right now.

24 The second building is in design, and
25 that's the nuclear facility that the main focus of

1 this Environmental Impact Statement Supplement is
2 about, but there is more that I will get into in a
3 minute.

4 Since the time that the Environmental
5 Impact Statement was prepared, there has been
6 additional geological mapping at the site, and some
7 information on that is available at some of the
8 poster sessions out in the hallway. So basically
9 they exposed some of the strata on the proposed
10 construction site, and they did some crack mapping.
11 They were looking for the presence of faults. They
12 also did borehole investigations, and so they have a
13 better idea now of the geologic conditions directly
14 underlying the site.

15 In addition in 2007, a final or an update
16 to the probabilistic seismic hazard analysis at the
17 laboratory, which focused primarily on the area of
18 Technical Area 55 and Technical Area 3, was
19 finalized. One of the outcomes of that analysis was
20 that the ground motions, the ground accelerations
21 associated with a postulated earthquake that might
22 impact the site that would form the basis for the
23 design increased those ground accelerations.

24 So both of those factors combined were
25 looked at as the design became more mature, and that

1 identified the fact that certain aspects of the
2 building would require significant upgrading as the
3 design progressed to resist those earthquake forces
4 and potential other interactions with that geologic
5 site.

6 So that work was analyzed, and last summer
7 the laboratory prepared a supplement analysis, and
8 that's part of the NEPA requirements, to determine
9 whether or not enough change had been identified
10 such that a Supplemental Environmental Impact
11 Statement should be prepared. The outcome of that,
12 even though that supplement analysis was not
13 formally decided upon, the NNSA did decide to pursue
14 the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.
15 That's the draft that's currently out for public
16 review.

17 We had a Notice of Intent that was issued
18 on October 1st in the Federal Register. That was a
19 Notice of Intent to prepare the Supplemental
20 Environmental Impact Statement. As part of that, we
21 had two public scoping meetings in White Rock and
22 Pojoaque in early to mid October last year.

23 So taking that information and some other
24 initial internal scoping within the NNSA, we started
25 preparation of the Supplemental Environmental Impact

1 Statement, looking at the environmental impacts of
2 those changes primarily to the construction of the
3 facility, but also the operations that I will get
4 into here. There are some additional types of
5 analysis required due to new requirements in 2003.

6 So some of the new analyses you will see
7 in the document are analysis of greenhouse gas
8 emissions. That's from construction operations as
9 well as operations in the facility long-term. The
10 intentional destructive acts, there is a new
11 requirement that we do that, so we have an analysis
12 that we perform for those things like terrorist
13 incidents that you might see inside the facility and
14 the impacts of those. And we also updated the
15 analyses, as I said, for construction, for
16 operations, and those are operations for the
17 existing Chemical and Metallurgy Research Building
18 that was completed in 1952.

19 We also did the operations impacts for the
20 RLUOB facility that I had just mentioned, because we
21 have very good data on that now that the design is
22 complete. We also did operations impacts associated
23 with the proposed new nuclear facility. We also
24 updated the accident analyses for the existing CMR
25 Building. That's based on a documented safety

1 analysis that our office approved last summer, as
2 well as the preliminary documented safety analysis,
3 the most recent version of that that the project
4 prepared last summer and also approved by our
5 office.

6 The last thing that we updated is the
7 impacts, human health impacts, primarily
8 radiological impacts, and there were a few things
9 that were involved in that. One of them, there were
10 some modeling changes in the modeling software
11 that's used. And we also took advantage of the very
12 latest census data available at the time. Now, all
13 that final documentation or the data for the census
14 has still not been received, but that will be folded
15 in as it becomes available for the final EIS,
16 Supplemental EIS.

17 So briefly the alternatives we looked at,
18 there is a No Action Alternative, and the No Action
19 Alternative is in the sense that that no action
20 means no change to the Record of Decision back in
21 2004, so we would not change our direction in terms
22 of the decisions made based on the past NEPA
23 analysis.

24 We also have a modified CMRR nuclear
25 facility alternative, and that's a facility that

1 incorporates the additional strengthening of the
2 facility to resist the earthquake forces at the
3 facility. And one thing that we did identify since
4 the time of the scoping meeting, the project team,
5 as the design developed a little further, they
6 identified a possibility that we may be able to
7 build the same facility, the same modified nuclear
8 facility that was described in the Notice of Intent,
9 which we call now the deep excavation option. We
10 also identified the possibility of a shallow
11 excavation option, which is basically the same
12 facility built on the same piece of ground but built
13 higher up in the strata so as to avoid the one layer
14 that we were more concerned about beneath the
15 facility site.

16 The last alternative we looked at is the
17 No Construction Alternative, and that's to continue
18 to use the existing CMR Building as long as we can
19 without significant upgrades at a reduced amount of
20 programmatic operations because of its vulnerability
21 to seismic, so that's the No Construction
22 Alternative that we analyzed.

23 So a little bit more about the process of
24 where we are now as far as the public and
25 stakeholder participation. We posted the Draft

1 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on the
2 NNSA website on April 22nd. That was followed the
3 following Friday by the Environmental Protection
4 Agency publishing the Notice of Availability in the
5 Federal Register, and that publication in the
6 Federal Register started the formal 45 day comment
7 review period.

8 Subsequent to that, based on input and
9 requests from members of the public, the NNSA
10 decided on May 6th, to extend that comment period by
11 15 days, so the current comment period closes on
12 June 28th, 2011.

13 Bruce mentioned the public hearings. This
14 is the last of the four scheduled public hearings on
15 the project in the Supplemental Environmental Impact
16 Statement. We had meetings in Albuquerque on Monday
17 evening, Los Alamos on Tuesday evening, Española
18 yesterday evening, and then tonight is the final
19 public hearing.

20 Bruce mentioned a number of ways to
21 provide comments. There is no limit on the number
22 of times you might comment. You can use any of the
23 avenues. We don't want you to make one set. That
24 doesn't close the door for you. Feel free, to the
25 end of the comment period, to make comments using

1 any of the means that are available to do that, and
2 I encourage that type of input from the concerned
3 people and to forward the draft document comments to
4 us.

5 With that I would like to turn it over to
6 Bruce, and he will go over the final ground rules
7 before we get started. Thank you.

8 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you.

9 Before we start, I noticed there are a few
10 video cameras rolling, and I just want to mention
11 that those are not cameras that are operated
12 officially by the Department of Energy or as an
13 adjunct to this meeting. So if anybody objects to
14 being videotaped, you will need to take that up
15 directly with the videographer.

16 We have a pretty good number of folks who
17 want to comment tonight, and the process has been
18 designed with a preference to make sure that
19 everybody has an opportunity to speak. Anybody who
20 wants to speak in the allotted time we try to
21 accommodate. The meeting will run until 9:00, and
22 we will try to manage the time within that time
23 limit to ensure that everybody who has registered
24 has a chance to speak. Does anybody have an
25 objection to the process trying to enable that

1 everybody who has signed up has a chance to speak?

2 You object to that?

3 MS. JONI ARENDS: Joni Arends with
4 Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety. We were one
5 of the signers on to the e-mail that requested
6 additional time if there were enough people, and Mr.
7 Tegtmeier said that if possible we would stay until
8 10:00. So I don't know the amount of time or the
9 number of people that have registered to speak. It
10 would be interesting to know, because there has been
11 a difference of the amount of time. In Albuquerque
12 first there was five minutes. Then it got changed
13 to three. In Los Alamos there was seven minutes,
14 and last night there was five minutes. So I would
15 like to understand how many minutes are currently
16 scheduled for people to speak.

17 MR. MacALLISTER: I can answer that
18 question. I can't answer how many are registered,
19 because we continue to take people as they show up.
20 It looks like, based on our best estimate -- and
21 once we make this decision, we stick to it -- that
22 we will be able to provide the five minute time
23 limits.

24 Is there anybody who has any objection to
25 me treating each speaker equally with respect to the

1 amount of time? All right. Finally is there
2 anybody who believes they are entitled to more time
3 than the allotted five minutes?

4 MR. DOUG DORAN: We would have the right
5 to yield the balance of the time. If we didn't take
6 the full amount of time, we could yield it to
7 someone else?

8 MR. MacALLISTER: No. You have the right
9 to yield your block of time. We can't get into
10 measuring fractions of minutes for time. If we run
11 ahead, that time goes into the pool, at the end of
12 meeting, wherein we take open questions, open
13 comments.

14 If on the other hand somebody runs out of
15 time and the audience would like to hear more of
16 them and somebody chooses to yield their time slot
17 to that speaker, when I reach that person's card,
18 and I call them, they can tell me I yield my
19 position to a particular speaker. I will move that
20 person's card who yielded to the back of the stack,
21 and if there is time allowed, we will take that
22 comment at the end before we conclude the meeting.
23 Right now it looks like we will have plenty of time.

24 Another question from Joni Arends.

25 MS. ARENDS: Yes. I have a due process

1 question. At the three other hearings there was an
2 opportunity for a second round.

3 MR. MacALLISTER: Yes.

4 MS. ARENDS: Is there an opportunity for a
5 second round this evening?

6 MR. MacALLISTER: As with all the other
7 hearings, the second round is contingent upon there
8 being available time. At every other meeting, even
9 at last night's meeting where there were more people
10 signed up, we did have time for some follow-up
11 questions. So I anticipate that as long as there is
12 time available, that we will have second round.

13 Now, this facility has limits on how late
14 we can remain in this facility. I will point out
15 that this is the fourth meeting. My understanding
16 is that the due process requirements for meetings
17 technically have been fulfilled. I am looking at
18 the document manager for verification of that. He
19 is, just for the record, indicating that that's the
20 case.

21 I have no doubt, as soon as we roll into
22 this, that there will be ample opportunity for
23 follow-up comments. Okay.

24 MS. ARENDS: I reserve time to object
25 during the process. Thank you.

1 MR. MacALLISTER: You can use your time,
2 your allotted time for anything you want.

3 As far as the ground rules going on,
4 please wait until your scheduled time to provide
5 comments. Heckling from the audience, there is
6 absolutely zero tolerance for it. We don't want any
7 speaker of any philosophy, any position they want to
8 take feeling remotely intimidated in terms of their
9 ability to give their honest opinion to the document
10 manager. So please reserve your applause, and
11 please refrain from making comments during people's
12 presentations.

13 It's important that we don't interrupt
14 presentations with shouting or comments, because
15 this is a transcribed hearing and the court reporter
16 has to hear the speaker.

17 Sir, you had a question.

18 MR. ERWIN JULIAN RIVERA: (Comments in
19 Spanish.)

20 MR. MacALLISTER: As far as a translator,
21 John, we don't have that capacity at tonight's
22 meeting.

23 MR. RIVERA: It's okay. I do.

24 MR. MacALLISTER: I will be calling you by
25 name. So in the first round it's a little less

1 critical; however, I am famous for mispronouncing
2 some people's names. So it's helpful when you come
3 to the mike to please confirm, yes, my name is Joe
4 Jones, because I may have mispronounced your name.
5 For the record, it will be helpful for us to make
6 sure we have the right people in the right order.

7 Yes, sir.

8 MR. KEN LAING: Do you intend to remove
9 people who refuse to stop speaking after their time
10 by force?

11 MR. MacALLISTER: I am getting to that.

12 I am asking you all to abide by the time
13 limits. There is not going to be anybody here -- I
14 have no intention of arm wrestling with anybody at
15 the mike. However, if we cannot maintain order and
16 if people refuse to yield the floor following the
17 ground rules of the meeting, I will put the meeting
18 into recess, the court reporter will be instructed
19 to stop taking the official transcription, and the
20 mike will be cut off, and we will be in recess
21 unless and until we can restore order and the next
22 speaker is up to speak.

23 MR. LAING: So was last night's attempt to
24 remove a speaker peculiar to that setting? We are
25 not intending to do that again?

1 MR. MacALLISTER: There was no attempt to
2 remove a speaker. There was an attempt to get the
3 speaker to yield the floor. I'm not going to argue
4 about other -- I'm going through the ground rules
5 for tonight. We have made some adjustments to make
6 it clear that we intend to give everybody an equal
7 opportunity to participate in the meeting.

8 Again, please keep your comments as civil
9 as you can and finish your statement as early as
10 possible.

11 Sir, you have a comment.

12 MR. KIRK OWENS: If somebody would like to
13 give comments in other than English, since we can't
14 accommodate anything else here, we can take comments
15 in another language, and there is also an audio
16 recording capability out here. If you leave them in
17 Spanish or a native language, we will make every
18 attempt to get them translated for the document.

19 MR. RIVERA: I don't mean to be
20 argumentative, but we requested that in many
21 hearings and to have the reports issued back --
22 based on the New Mexico Constitution, we are an
23 official bilingual state, and we have yet to receive
24 anything back in answer to our request. I
25 appreciate your comment, but it's still not adequate

1 for us, but I am multi-lingual.

2 MR. MacALLISTER: And again, if we cannot
3 regain order of the meeting, we will be in recess.
4 However, we will continue to take comments from
5 people at the kiosk, and there will be an ultimate
6 decision about whether to adjourn the meeting or to
7 continue based on our ability to restore the
8 structure of the meeting.

9 A final comment, a final request on my
10 part is please silence your cell phones and anything
11 else that might make noise at this time so that the
12 speakers are not interrupted. And again, just as a
13 reminder, I will be taking comments from any elected
14 officials first, or representatives of those
15 offices, at the outset of the hearing, and then I
16 will be taking the next comments in order.

17 I believe we have at least one
18 representative of an elected official here, Jennifer
19 Catechis. Pardon me if I mispronounce.

20 MS. JENNIFER CATECHIS: It's close, very
21 close. I am with Congressman Lujan.

22 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you. And would
23 you like to speak, ma'am?

24 MS. CATECHIS: No.

25 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you. Thank you.

1 Are there any other representatives or
2 elected officials, representatives of offices that
3 are from the elected officials' offices here present
4 tonight? Are there any tribal officials present
5 tonight? Any municipal or county? All right.

6 Then without further adieu, we will begin
7 the process.

8 One last ground rule, to help you with the
9 timing to abide by the five minute rule, you will
10 see at your four minutes, at one minute out, our
11 timekeeper will hold up a yellow card, so you will
12 know that it's time to begin preparing to conclude
13 your statement. When you see the red card, your
14 time is up. If you don't wrap up in a timely manner
15 with the red card, I will approach the podium and
16 ask you to yield the floor. If at that time you
17 don't yield the floor, I will instruct the court
18 reporter to cease recording, and we will go off the
19 record, and we will be officially in recess until
20 such time as we get the podium back. Thank you.

21 Okay. Our first speaker -- I will be
22 calling out the name of the first speaker. Then I
23 will, as with the other meetings, call out the next
24 person in line to speak so that that person can be
25 getting ready.

1 Our first speaker is Ray M. Baca and he
2 will be followed by Danny Beavers.

3 MR. RAY M. BACA: Thank you very much. My
4 name is Ray Baca. I am the executive director for
5 the New Mexico Building Trades Council. In that
6 capacity, I represent all of the construction labor
7 unions here in the state of New Mexico. This
8 includes approximately 800 construction and
9 maintenance workers that are currently employed by
10 the laboratory.

11 These are good-paying, family-sustaining
12 jobs that unfortunately are not otherwise available
13 in northern New Mexico to that degree. As most of
14 you may already know, the construction industry in
15 New Mexico, as it is in much of the country, is in a
16 depressed state. The unemployment rate for
17 construction workers is fully double and in many
18 cases triple that of the average unemployed New
19 Mexican. It is not uncommon for us to see
20 unemployment rates of 27 to almost 30 percent in the
21 various crafts that we represent.

22 This project, the CMR project, if and when
23 it comes to be, would employ upwards of nearly 1,000
24 construction workers off and on over the course of a
25 10 to 12 year period. Obviously this would be a

1 huge boost to the construction industry in New
2 Mexico. It would be a huge boost to economic
3 development and opportunity in northern New Mexico,
4 but much more importantly, it would be a huge boost
5 to those working construction families in New Mexico
6 that are in dire straits.

7 With all due respect to those of you who
8 are opposed to the project, we respectfully urge the
9 laboratory and DOE and all the other powers that be
10 to begin this project sooner than later. Thank you.

11 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir.

12 Our next speaker is Danny Beavers and he
13 will be followed by Jennifer Sequeieira.

14 MR. DANNY BEAVERS: My name is Danny
15 Beavers. I am a business representative for the
16 United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters. I
17 am here today to speak in favor of the proposed
18 project for a couple of reasons. Throughout my
19 lifetime, there have been nuclear weapons, and I'm
20 sure they will be around long after my life is over.
21 In my opinion, they are and will continue to be
22 necessary to assure the safety, freedom, and way of
23 life of our country.

24 Next, the current facility was opened in
25 the late '50s, early '60s, and has been in operation

1 for well over 50 years. Due to the fact that
2 nuclear weapons are going to continue to be a
3 reality, I would personally feel better knowing that
4 that type of work is being done in a new state of
5 the art facility as opposed to an antiquated
6 facility.

7 Lastly is the economic impact of a project
8 of this size, not only to northern New Mexico but
9 the entire state of New Mexico, from vendors to
10 suppliers, not to mention the estimated 1,000
11 construction workers that it is scheduled to employ
12 over the course of the project. These are all
13 good-paying jobs that include family health care and
14 pensions. Therefore, I stand in favor of this
15 project and respectfully request that it move
16 forward without further delay. Thank you.

17 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir.

18 Our next speaker is Jennifer Sequieira
19 followed by Scott Kovac.

20 Jennifer Sequieira.

21 Scott Kovac.

22 MR. SCOTT KOVAC: Good evening. Thank
23 you, everyone, for coming out this evening.

24 Members of the public who have spoken in
25 support of this CMRR -- sorry. Members of the

1 public who have spoken out in support of the CMRR
2 nuclear facility who just left, have, for the most
3 part, pointed to jobs that would --

4 (There was a buzzing sound from the mike.)

5 MR. MacALLISTER: See if that's better.

6 MR. KOVAC: My time is not starting yet.

7 All right. Members of the public who have
8 spoken in support of the CMRR nuclear facility so
9 far have pointed to the jobs that have been
10 produced. Nuclear Watch New Mexico agrees that more
11 jobs are sorely needed in northern New Mexico. We
12 don't agree that the CMRR nuclear facility is the
13 right way to get these jobs.

14 First of all, it is wrong to advocate
15 nuclear weapons programs as a job program.
16 Secondly, \$6 billion for an expanded production
17 complex for plutonium bomb triggers is an
18 astronomical amount of money, but what do we really
19 get in the way of added jobs? The answer is
20 nothing. There is no net increase in permanent
21 jobs. This is not just nuke watch saying this.
22 This is the Supplemental EIS saying it also.

23 The CMRR-NF would not create additional
24 jobs. It would simply relocate existing employees
25 from an old facility to a new facility, one that

1 would cost around \$10,000 a square foot to build.
2 To quote the summary of the Supplemental EIS,
3 approximately 550 workers would be at the CMRR
4 facility. They would come from the old CMR Building
5 and other facilities at LANL, so the facility would
6 not increase employment or change socioeconomic
7 conditions in the region. I will say that last line
8 again -- so the facility would not increase
9 employment or change socioeconomic conditions in the
10 region.

11 What the \$6 billion approximately CMRR
12 project would do is help reserve the socioeconomic
13 status quo for Los Alamos County, which is already
14 the sixth richest county in the United States and is
15 tied for the lowest unemployment rate in the United
16 States. This is all while public school teachers
17 are being laid off in neighboring Rio Arriba County
18 and in the majority of states across the country.

19 The nuclear facility does create
20 additional construction jobs, but these are limited
21 to last only a finite period of time. The SEIS
22 states that there will be an average of only 420
23 construction jobs over nine years, with a peak of
24 790 jobs. The SEIS further states construction
25 employment would represent less than one percent of

1 the regional workforce and would have little
2 socioeconomic effect.

3 In short, it's remarkable how little \$6
4 billion buys for northern New Mexico. Let's look at
5 the math. For the sake of discussion, let's assume
6 that the average construction worker makes 40 bucks
7 an hour for 2,000 hours during an average work year.
8 With an average of 420 construction workers over
9 nine years, that would be a payroll of a little over
10 \$300 million or just five percent of the total
11 project costs. This is less than has already been
12 spent so far for the design alone of the CMRR
13 facility. Design costs are now at \$500 million and
14 climbing, and have we seen any socioeconomic gain
15 from that? Has anybody noticed?

16 Nuclear Watch New Mexico argues that far
17 more jobs could be created than through almost any
18 federal effort over the CMRR nuclear facility. Its
19 limited positive socioeconomic impacts will stay
20 mostly in Los Alamos County and will hardly be
21 noticed in the rest of northern New Mexico. Only
22 crumbs will roll off the hill to the rest of us as
23 usual.

24 To invoke a cliché: Why can't we have
25 clean, green jobs instead of mean jobs? A \$6

1 billion plutonium investment will lock Los Alamos '
2 future into the hopefully shrinking business of
3 nuclear weapons production and research and will be
4 a loser in the long run for job production. Full
5 clean-up of LANL's radioactive waste dump is
6 estimated to cost \$32 billion, but the lab opposes
7 that form of clean-up because it's far too
8 expensive.

9 This may be, but while protecting our
10 environment in the Rio Grande, what a job producer
11 comprehensive clean-up at the lab would be. Thank
12 you.

13 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you. (Applause)

14 Actually that reminds me of one thing that
15 I should have mentioned. If you have a written
16 statement that you would like to submit to the court
17 reporter to make sure that you have got word for
18 word what you wanted to say in the record, that's
19 more than welcome as well. All right.

20 Our next speaker will be Robert Gilkeson
21 followed by Dave McCoy.

22 MR. ROBERT H. GILKESON: Thank you. My
23 name is Robert Gilkeson. I am a registered
24 geologist with over 40 years of experience with
25 activities in the earth sciences, including teaching

1 at the University of Illinois, research and ground
2 water contamination issues across the United States
3 and especially at Los Alamos National Laboratory,
4 research and exploration for ground water resources,
5 and research in seismic geophysics.

6 From 1988 to 1999, I was a technical
7 consultant at Los Alamos National Laboratory on
8 issues of environmental contamination, and I was the
9 lead consultant for a period of a few years for
10 installation of the large network of monitoring
11 wells in the regional aquifer below and away from
12 the laboratory.

13 In 2009, I wrote a paper with Joni Arends,
14 the executive director of Concerned Citizens for
15 Nuclear Safety about the large number of
16 deficiencies in the LANL 2007 Probabilistic Site
17 Wide Seismic Hazard Analysis Report. There was a
18 mouthful. And also in the geotechnical report, the
19 2005 geotechnical report for the geotechnical
20 investigation of the seismic hazard at the proposed
21 site for the CMRR facility in Technical Area 55.

22 Joni Arends and I took that paper to a
23 meeting with the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety
24 Board in Washington, DC on May 23rd of 2009. And
25 that paper, currently Joni and I are updating the

1 paper for current events, and that will be provided
2 to this hearing by the end of the public comment
3 period.

4 My presentation today is the findings and
5 conclusions in a paper written by scientists at the
6 Los Alamos National Laboratory with their studies to
7 identify that there has been active earthquake with
8 surface rupture at least three times during the
9 period of the Holocene. And the Holocene covers
10 earth history going back to 10,000 years from the
11 present. It's a very excellent paper, and it was
12 published in the June 2009 issue of a journal named
13 "Geosphere."

14 The name of the paper -- if I can find it
15 here -- "Fault interaction and along-strike
16 variation in throw in the Pajarito fault system, Rio
17 Grande rift, New Mexico." I have a handout which
18 will be out where the CCNS materials are, the table
19 of CCNS materials, and there is a map on the back of
20 that handout that shows the great complexity of the
21 Pajarito fault system. It's a network of faults
22 that extends from north of Los Alamos to south of
23 Los Alamos to approximately Cochiti Pueblo. The
24 fault is over a total distance of around 48
25 kilometers or 29 miles.

1 I'm going to read some of the findings in
2 the report by the LANL scientists. From the
3 abstract, "The seismically active Pajarito fault
4 system of northern New Mexico, United States, is a
5 complex zone of deformation made up of many
6 laterally discontinuous faults and associated folds
7 and fractures that interact in ways that have
8 important implications for seismic hazards at Los
9 Alamos National Laboratory," and I would say
10 including Technical Area 55, the proposed site for
11 the CMRR facility.

12 From the conclusion section of their
13 report, I'm going to present the bulleted findings:
14 New paleoseismic data show three Holocene surface
15 rupturing earthquakes, one ground surface rupturing
16 event, 1,400 years ago on the Pajarito fault; a
17 second ground surface rupturing event from 5,200 to
18 2,500 years ago. That's the range of time.

19 MR. MacALLISTER: Sir, your time is up to
20 take a closing statement.

21 MR. GILKESON: That was five minutes
22 already?

23 VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: Can I yield?

24 MR. MacALLISTER: No, you can't yield now.
25 You can yield when it's your turn.

1 VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: Well, I can pull my
2 card out right now.

3 MR. MacALLISTER: It doesn't work that
4 way, because others signed up hoping to get in here.

5 MR. GILKESON: Let's hold to the rules. I
6 will probably get a chance later to finish this.

7 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir.

8 MR. GILKESON: There is a handout of this
9 report at the table with CCNS materials. Thank you.

10 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir.

11 (Applause)

12 Our next speaker is Dave McCoy followed by
13 Bob Walsh.

14 MR. DAVE MCCOY: Dave McCoy, director of
15 Citizen Action.

16 As an attorney, I want to address some of
17 the legal issues. First I want to address the raft.
18 If the raft won't float, we are going to sink and
19 all be on the nuclear brink.

20 Anyhow, to hold DOE accountable to protect
21 public health and safety, Congress should introduce
22 legislation for the public to bring a citizen suit
23 against the DOE for violation of the DOE Orders.
24 DOE Orders sound good but are not rigorously
25 enforced by DOE.

1 In the case of the SEIS, there is no
2 safety analysis report that has been issued as is
3 required to be performed, quote, at the earliest
4 practicable point in conceptual or preliminary
5 design for which we have spent \$500 million already.
6 Adequate protection of the public and workers is not
7 assured because the chosen site above volcanic ash
8 is a seismic formula for disaster.

9 Deactivation, decommissioning,
10 decontamination at end of life are not considered in
11 the SEIS proposed 50 years of operation. Waste
12 disposal operations are not considered in the SEIS
13 and the liquid radioactive waste facility is at the
14 end of its operational lifetime.

15 The controlling statutes are DOE Order
16 420.1 and DOE Guidance 420.1-2 which requires
17 structures, systems, components at DOE facilities be
18 designed and constructed to withstand the effects of
19 natural phenomena and hazards.

20 Now, you can't very well know what the
21 health impacts are going to be where the full
22 seismic hazards are not known. The choice of this
23 location as a site is extremely poor. Other
24 requirements are found in DOE Order 5480.28, and
25 they are supposed to provide for safety work places,

1 protect against property loss or damage, continued
2 operation of essential facilities, and protecting
3 public health, property, and the environment against
4 exposure to hazardous materials.

5 Well, we don't know what the hazard is
6 going to be there, so we don't know what the
7 exposure might be in the event of an accident. In
8 fact, we don't even know what a full accident can be
9 there. They talk about a spill. Well, it could
10 certainly be more than a spill of plutonium when
11 they are talking about 13,200 pounds being stored in
12 the same location and the possibility for ground
13 rupture at the site.

14 There is also Executive Order 12699. I'm
15 not going to go through that, just cite it.

16 LANL is choosing to not know the hazard by
17 doing poor quality work. In 1992, the SHB-1
18 borehole at TA-55 was drilled. The seismic profile
19 from the borehole was published in Wong, et al. in
20 1995. LANL scientists knew from the velocity
21 profile for this borehole that there were low shear
22 velocities that greatly increased the seismic hazard
23 at the TA-55 site for use of plutonium bomb factory.

24 Rather than recognize the problem, LANL
25 low-balled the cost to Congress for the facility

1 even though LANL knew the initial design was
2 incorrect and not supported by their own
3 information. Then there came a 1995 study: Seismic
4 margins assessment of the plutonium processing
5 facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

6 They said they couldn't meet the DOE Order
7 5480.28, and stated, "Results of this study indicate
8 that seismically induced loads will be significantly
9 greater than those for which the structures,
10 systems, and components for the plutonium processing
11 facility, PF-4, at Technical Area 55 were designed."
12 The study was based on a value of .33 g, ground
13 acceleration.

14 This 1995 report was made before the
15 knowledge obtained in the May 2007 probabilistic
16 seismic hazard analysis that indicated an increased
17 acceleration value of .5 g. Even the .5 g
18 acceleration is questionable and may be an
19 underestimate, because selection of Kappa that was
20 used was based on compromised data.

21 How many minutes do I have left?

22 THE TIMEKEEPER: You are just about done.

23 MR. McCOY: You have touted the 2007
24 report, the update. Well, let's look at Chapter 10
25 and what it says. Recalculate the hazard, conduct

1 additional detailed high precision mapping and
2 displacement measurements, conduct paleoseismic
3 trenching studies of Santa Clara Canyon, reevaluate
4 the entire data schedule for the Rio Grande rift,
5 conduct additional studies to better constrain
6 Kappa. Kappa is a key parameter in assessing the
7 hazard at LANL. Improvements in the network may be
8 necessary to improve data quality. No improvement
9 has been made.

10 So to sum up, you haven't done the work,
11 you haven't done the studies, you are exposing the
12 public to great risk, and you need to stop this
13 project. Thank you. (Applause)

14 MR. MacALLISTER: The next speaker is Bob
15 Walsh followed by Jan Boyer.

16 MR. BOB WALSH: Please hold the timing
17 flags up high and wiggle them so I will notice them.

18 THE TIMEKEEPER: Yes, sir.

19 MR. WALSH: Thank you.

20 My name is Bob Walsh. I am retired from a
21 career which included many years of nuclear safety
22 analysis.

23 About 20 years ago, I was the lead on a
24 safety analysis for a proposed plutonium storage
25 facility for Pantex in Texas. We found that

1 aircraft accidents from overflights were a signature
2 contributor to risk with possibly horrendous
3 consequences.

4 Last November I commented on the potential
5 scope of the SEIS, asking that they be sure to
6 include the accident analysis and potential
7 terrorist acts. In the draft SEIS, there was a
8 response that says that the accident analyses
9 present the impacts of a range of possible
10 accidents, and that a classified appendix was
11 prepared to address the impact of intentional
12 destructive acts, including terrorism, but
13 substantive details were not released to the public,
14 because disclosure could be exploited by terrorists,
15 which is reasonable.

16 In the appendix that actually evaluates
17 accident impacts, Section C.3, it states that
18 selection and evaluation of accidents was based on
19 the "Nonreactor SAR Preparation Guide." In that
20 guide, Section 3.4 states, external events will be
21 analyzed if frequency of occurrence is estimated to
22 exceed 10 to the minus six per year conservatively
23 calculated, or 10 to the minus 7 per year
24 realistically calculated. The analysis that
25 substantiates frequency need only be referenced.

1 In the draft SEIS, Chapter C.3.2 states,
2 "The probability of an airplane crash during
3 overflight is less than 10 to the minus six." There
4 are two deficiencies in this paragraph. First we
5 assume that they intended to say 10 to the minus six
6 per year. Second, no analysis is referenced to
7 support the statement.

8 Having discovered two oversights upon
9 examination of only one section suggests that this
10 document has not been subjected to rigorous,
11 independent review. The general public is neither
12 technically qualified nor adequately funded to
13 perform a comprehensive review. Consequently, I
14 have four comments, all of which are in the form of
15 requests.

16 One, please provide a reference to an
17 analysis that substantiates the probability of an
18 airplane crash during overflight does not exceed 10
19 to the minus six per year conservatively calculated.

20 Second, please provide a rigorous
21 independent review of this document by an
22 independent professional organization in order to
23 increase public confidence in the conclusions.

24 Third, please provide an unclassified
25 overview of the classified appendix, omitting

1 details but including at least answers to the
2 following questions: First, does the appendix
3 include consideration of attacks using aircraft?
4 Second, in determining risk from terrorist attacks,
5 does the appendix assume continued funding for
6 government agencies other than NNSA, such as the
7 Transportation Security Administration? Third, does
8 the appendix estimate the consequence of a
9 successful terrorist attack? If so, have these
10 potential consequences been brought to the attention
11 of the president and congress for consideration in
12 decisions on nuclear weapons policy.

13 And then the fourth request, please
14 provide a rigorous independent review of the
15 classified appendix by an independent professional
16 organization with appropriate clearances, and
17 include in this environmental impact statement an
18 unclassified summary of that assessment. Please
19 include the identity of the organization, and the
20 amount budgeted for the review as an insurance that
21 the review is independent and thorough. Thank you.
22 (Applause)

1 MR. MacALLISTER: Our next speaker will be
2 Jan Boyer, followed by Charles Cole.

3 MS. BOYER: My name is Jan Boyer, and I'm
4 very concerned about this facility and request that an
5 environmental assessment be done at this time because of
6 the magnitude of the changes since the beginning of the
7 planning around that.

8 I'm also speaking because I keep
9 remembering a talk that Winona LaDuke gave one time, and
10 she said, You know, when my children make a mess, they
11 can't make another mess until they clean up the first
12 mess.

13 I wish that would be considered in issues
14 like this, because to me, there is an awful lot of
15 toxicity that could be cleaned up before we make more
16 messes. So I'm pretty concerned about that.

17 The other thing is, I have a master's
18 degree in clinical psychology, so I'm fascinated by how
19 people use themselves and their skills. And one of the
20 things I know is that scientists do really good science.
21 Thank goodness. I really have a lot of respect for the
22 way scientists do science. The only problem is that in
23 human capability, the weakness of scientists is in
24 noticing the implications of their actions. That's the
25 weakest link in the way a scientist thinks. What are

1 the long-term effects? What are the implications?

2 So when I read that this is going to house
3 six tons of plutonium, I can't believe that. I keep
4 thinking, gee, I must have made a mistake in reading
5 that, but I think I read that in a few places. Isn't
6 plutonium one of those things that has a half life of
7 something like 108,000 years? I can't imagine having
8 this much toxicity.

9 There are a number of authorities speaking
10 out these days from the United States and other
11 countries, and they're saying, you know, there are so
12 many toxins in our environment that people cannot
13 thrive. Even on the news hour, they've had a primary
14 medical researcher from Harvard and she said, The issue
15 with autism is the carcinogenic substances, the
16 endocrine disrupters and all of the toxins. A child can
17 no longer thrive in the United States. That's kind of
18 daunting to me because I'm one of the kinds of people
19 who does think about the long-term implications.

20 So if anybody wants to party with six tons
21 of plutonium, I think that deserves a very serious
22 diagnosis.

23 Please don't do this. This is just too
24 bizarre.

25 Thank you.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, ma'am.

3 Our next speaker is Charles Cole, followed
4 by Bridgette Kennedy.

5 MR. COLE: My name is Charles Cole. I'm a
6 resident of Santa Fe, and I was the coordinator for the
7 Faith Conference of Nuclear Weapons, which was held here
8 in Santa Fe in 2010. I'm speaking as a member of the
9 United Methodist Church and as director of the General
10 Board of Church and Society of the Church.

11 The SEIS declares that pit production does
12 not take place at the CMR Building, and it will not take
13 place in any Chemistry and Metallurgy Research
14 Replacement facility. But the SEIS also states, quote:
15 "All nuclear analytical chemistry, AC, and materials
16 characterization, MC, will be housed in the Hazard
17 Category 2 nuclear laboratory building," unquote, part
18 of the proposed CMR nuclear facility. And, quote, "AC
19 and MC services support virtually all nuclear programs
20 at LANL." It seems, then, that although pit production
21 will not take place specifically in the proposed new
22 facility, the CMRR-NF, this new facility will support
23 pit production at LANL, which may reach a total of 80
24 pits per year.

25 This increased pit production is ostensibly

1 part of a Stockpile Stewardship Program whose
2 implementation, according to the Nuclear Posture Review
3 completed by the Obama administration last year, is,
4 quote, "essential to facilitating reductions while
5 sustaining deterrence under New START and beyond."

6 The Stockpile Stewardship Program, then, is
7 to support reductions and to sustain deterrence. Let me
8 address the deterrence issue. At our Faith Conference
9 on Nuclear Weapons, Dr. Joseph Martz, J. Perry Fellow in
10 National Security, Stanford University -- and I believe
11 still related to LANL -- defined deterrence as, quote,
12 "the ability to inflict unacceptable costs upon an
13 adversary, such that that adversary is deterred from
14 conducting an undesired act."

15 The United Methodist Church declared in a
16 resolution passed at its 2008 General Conference, of
17 which I was a member, that quote: "The doctrine of
18 nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt and spiritually
19 bankrupt," unquote.

20 Why is this so? The first reason is
21 prudential. Nuclear deterrence is not an effective
22 doctrine for the new age of global terrorism. In fact,
23 the production of more plutonium simply makes more
24 material available for terrorists to steal and use in
25 making nuclear weapons.

1 The second reason is moral. As the United
2 Methodist resolution states, quote: "When used as
3 instruments of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent
4 people hostage for political and military purposes."
5 Among those held hostage are United States citizens, who
6 must live in continual dread of nuclear war. And
7 when even conventional military weapons take a heavy
8 toll of civilians, the use of nuclear weapons threatens
9 an even higher rate of civilian casualties.

10 I and others in the United Methodist
11 Church, then, question both the wisdom and the morality
12 of the new CMRR facility. To continue to produce more
13 pits works against President Obama's goal of a
14 nuclear-free future. Producing more plutonium pits as a
15 way to facilitate reductions is inconsistent with the
16 pursuit of this future.

17 Our national security needs can be met
18 within the \$750 billion national defense budget for 2011
19 without increasing plutonium pit production. We have
20 more than enough armaments to defend our country and
21 protect ourselves against purported terrorists.

22 We call on LANL to focus more on another of
23 its goals, quote: "To reduce the global danger from
24 weapons of mass destruction," unquote.

25 I would support the "No Action" alternative

1 of the SEIS, except that such an alternative does not
2 actually seem to be provided for in the SEIS. I ask,
3 then, that new alternatives be considered, including no
4 pit production at LANL.

5 Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. MacALLISTER: Our next speaker is
8 Bridjette Kennedy, followed by Angela Werneke.

9 MS. KENNEDY: Can I defer my time to Robert
10 Gilkeson?

11 MR. MacALLISTER: If you'd like to yield
12 the floor at this point --

13 MS. KENNEDY: Yeah, because I agree with
14 his position that the facility is unsafe, and he has
15 good scientific proof of that.

16 MR. MacALLISTER: Okay. Gilkeson, are you
17 available?

18 MR. GILKESON: What are the ground rules
19 this time?

20 MR. MacALLISTER: According to the ground
21 rules, you have another five minutes. The other speaker
22 yielded the position to you, so --

23 MR. GILKESON: Okay. The reason I am here
24 is that I pointed out at earlier meetings this week the
25 public was told that there has been no earthquake

1 activity on the fault system at Los Alamos National
2 Laboratory for longer than the past million years, and
3 that's simply incorrect. As shown by this excellent
4 report that I am just providing excerpts from, that show
5 the LANL scientists have determined that there have been
6 a minimum of three large earthquakes over the period of
7 the last 10,000 years. And by large earthquake, I mean
8 the power for ground rupture. And so I presented
9 excerpts from this report that describe that fact, and
10 that specifically is new PALEON scientists data show
11 three Pliocene [sic] -- that means the past 10,000
12 years -- surface rupturing earthquakes, one
13 ground-surface rupturing event 1400 years ago.

14 And then a second rupturing event that
15 occurred approximately between 5000 and 6500 years ago,
16 but there were two simultaneous earthquakes on different
17 fault segments at that time, for that earthquake event.
18 So there were two surface ruptures at that time.

19 And then the third ground-surface rupturing
20 event 9000 years ago was also separate rupturing
21 events -- ground-surface rupturing events on both the
22 Pajarito Fault and the Rendija Canyon Faults.

23 And then the report goes on and says: When
24 two ground-surface ruptures occur simultaneously as part
25 of the same event, the results in earthquake magnitude

1 is greater than when the main Pajarito Fault ruptures
2 alone.

3 Another excerpt is: The evidence for fault
4 interaction suggests the potential for static stress
5 concentrations and earthquake triggering.

6 So this means it's an active fault while
7 we're here this evening. There's movement going on on
8 this fault system at all times, and that movement is
9 gaining strength and will eventually trigger an
10 earthquake event.

11 So I think I'll stop with that, and thank
12 you.

13 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. MacALLISTER: Our next speaker is
16 Angela Werneke, followed by Caitlin McHugh.

17 MS. WERNEKE: I get really nervous speaking
18 in front of people, so bear with me.

19 First, as a New Mexican living downwind and
20 downstream in LANL, I feel the cleanup of existing
21 contamination is a priority over building a new pit
22 production facility, the sole purpose of which is to
23 perpetuate nuclear weapons.

24 Secondly, the United States is on the edge
25 of economic disaster, which can either be remedied or

1 exacerbated by the choices we make for ourselves. Do we
2 choose peace and prosperity or nuclear weapons. While
3 the defense budget continues to increase, one in four
4 Americans is worried about having enough food for their
5 families. Funding for defense may benefit a few, but
6 the vast majority of Americans will lose.

7 In truth, we all lose if we value weapons
8 production and poisoned rivers over peace, health and
9 prosperity for all.

10 Linda Hogan, in her book "Dwellings,"
11 speaks for many of us here when she says:

12 "Cornmeal and pollen are offered to the sun
13 at dawn. The ears of the corn are listening and
14 waiting. They want peace. The stalks of the corn want
15 clean water, the sun that is in its full clean shining.
16 The leaves of the corn want good earth. The earth wants
17 peace. The birds who eat the corn do not want poison.
18 Nothing wants to suffer. The wind does not want to
19 carry the stories of death." Rather, Linda Hogan goes
20 on to say: "The language of life won't be silenced."

21 Thank you.

22 (Applause.)

23 MR. MacALLISTER: Caitlin McHugh, followed
24 by Norman Budow.

25 MS. McHUGH: Hi. My name is Caitlin

1 McHugh, and I've lived in Santa Fe for the past 30
2 years. I'm not affiliated with any organizations. I
3 just feel very strongly that there hasn't been adequate
4 safety consideration given for this new facility.

5 The safety issue is a big, big problem,
6 contamination of our water, which we know is so precious
7 in this community, and also the geologic issues that
8 have been brought up.

9 I also feel that this Supplemental
10 Environmental Impact Study hasn't adequately addressed
11 all the options that are available. Basically, I find
12 it perverse that in the name of safety justifying
13 building of nuclear weapons, that the safety of the
14 local people haven't been considered in this -- in this
15 situation.

16 That's all I have to say. I would like --
17 I'd like our government to please protect us
18 appropriately.

19 Thank you.

20 (Applause.)

21 MR. MacALLISTER: Norman Budow, followed by
22 Susan Odiseos.

23 You can correct me.

24 MS. ODISEOS: Odiseos.

25 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you.

1 MR. BUDOW: Thank you, folks. Glad that
2 you're all here on this subject.

3 And I want to say that it's a subject near
4 and dear to my heart. Why? My granddaughter is a
5 seismologist in California, and her heart's desire is to
6 find a way to predictability [sic] of fault lines and
7 earthquakes. She read a paper in -- on the Island of
8 Hokkaido, Japan, a northernmost island. And I'm glad
9 she read it then because I wouldn't want her to go near
10 the Japanese archipelago now.

11 I have a little anecdote that might
12 emphasize why I'm concerned. My wife lost family over
13 from [sic] Ukraine. They lived 25 miles from Chernobyl.
14 We brought them here, and they were telling me how they
15 trusted and listened to their experts. And then she
16 said after they had the meltdown, they had people --
17 well, before the meltdown, they had scientists come from
18 their lab, and they were telling them, Be on guard.
19 They were telling them what vegetables and fruits they
20 could eat from their garden. It was sort of like --
21 sort of like playing Charade. You can eat the carrots
22 from here. Don't eat those radishes over there. And
23 she was, you know, kind of hurt that they believed and
24 believed.

25 Now, at Fukushima, there was a real

1 resentment that their experts told them; the nuclear
2 power plant was safe, safe, safe, and it turned out not
3 to be all that safe.

4 I had an experience a couple of years back
5 when Admiral Stansfield Turner, under the auspices of
6 the International Relations Community -- organization
7 here in Santa Fe. There was a dinner, and he was
8 speaking about his hope and desire to reduce the amount
9 of nuclear bombs from 6000 to 2000. And I was troubled
10 by that. And I was -- my banquet table -- my banquet
11 table was right underneath the speaker's dais. So I
12 asked him after the dinner, the supper, Why 2000,
13 reduced from 6000 to 2000; why not have it much less
14 than that or zero? And he looked at me and he said,
15 Well, I appreciate your concern; I appreciate your
16 concern, but it's a start; it's a start. So I was not
17 very, very happy at his attempts to comfort me, that
18 it's a start.

19 One of our desires is to prevent nuclear
20 proliferation. We provide a terrible, terrible example
21 where we continue -- continue proliferating our own --
22 it's like taking nuclear waste, making it over here, and
23 taking it out over there. And it's still here. It's
24 still here.

25 So I'm hoping that we can follow the edict

1 of Albert Einstein. And Albert Einstein made a
2 statement: The definition of insanity is to keep doing
3 the same thing over and over and over and expecting a
4 different result.

5 Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir.

8 Susan -- I won't butcher your last name
9 again -- followed by Jay Coghlan.

10 MS. ODISEOS: Susan Odiseos. It's a Greek
11 name, but I'm a Danish princess, in case anyone asks.

12 (Laughter.)

13 MS. ODISEOS: I'm a resident of Santa Fe.
14 I'm a member of the Justice and Peace Committee of
15 St. Pete's Church. You won't hear me talking in
16 technical terms because that's not what I do.

17 My comment to Mr. Tegtmeier and his
18 colleagues is going to be in the form of a question.
19 But to get to it, let's take, first, into account the
20 serious budget situation in our country, whereby the
21 funds sought for the CMRR facility could alleviate the
22 need to cut critical human service programs, and taking
23 into account that the old facility, which sits on a
24 fault, is only a little over a mile from the planned-for
25 facility. The new facility is within two-thirds of a

1 mile of a known fault. To add to that uncertainty, the
2 total extent of seismic fault under the lab is not
3 completely mapped. Haven't we learned anything from the
4 tragedy in Japan?

5 Use of the fear factor to propel
6 preparedness against our enemies is beyond
7 comprehension. The proposed amount of plutonium to be
8 stored so close to us, with all the risks entailed,
9 would create a bomb too big to drop without annihilating
10 mankind.

11 The unprecedented growth of this project
12 from a mere 350 million to now nearing 600 billion --
13 6 billion for just the nuclear facility, with final
14 design not yet completed, without an undated
15 environmental impact statement in place to accompany the
16 design changes, is most unfortunate, if not
17 irresponsible.

18 It's hard not to connect the dots and see
19 clearly that this project involves mostly privatization,
20 with private companies receiving more than 80 percent of
21 the monies involved.

22 Finally, the fact that so many people are
23 opposed to efforts to continue armament efforts, the
24 simple and straightforward question I have is: What
25 will it take for you to stop this project?

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you.

3 Jay Coghlan, followed by David Bacon.

4 MR. COGHLAN: I'm Jay Coghlan with Nuclear
5 Watch New Mexico. I spoke twice last night at the
6 Espanola --

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Speak louder.

8 MR. COGHLAN: Okay. Jay Coghlan.

9 MR. MacALLISTER: Do you want me to raise
10 that, Jay?

11 MR. COGHLAN: Yes, if you would.

12 Okay. Again, I'm Jay Coghlan with Nuclear
13 Watch New Mexico. I spoke twice last night at Espanola,
14 and time flies when you're having fun. I only got like
15 halfway through or something like that.

16 And I was looking to make two broad points.
17 You know, first of all, I note that these hearings and
18 the entire process is required by federal law, that
19 being the National Environmental Policy. And towards
20 that end, I -- I'm pointing to what I believe are two
21 possible broad legal deficiencies to the draft. And
22 specifically, it's that NNSA has chosen to not revisit
23 the need for the CMR nuclear facility. It basically
24 says that nothing has changed since the 2003
25 Environmental Impact Statement.

1 And then the other broad point that I'm
2 reaching for is that this draft Supplemental EIS doesn't
3 really offer genuine spectrum of reasonable
4 alternatives.

5 Now, with respect to the first point that I
6 made, again that I believe erroneously NNSA has not
7 decided to visit mission needs, again saying that not
8 much has changed since 2004, I was amused last week to
9 run across a new strategic plan by NNSA that the first
10 thing it said was how much things had changed since it
11 had last produced a strategic plan in 2004. And it
12 specifically -- it right away pointed to the speech that
13 Obama made in Prague in April 2009 in which the
14 President of the United States annunciated having a
15 future world free of nuclear weapons to be a national
16 security goal. So indeed much has changed.

17 Now, at the same time that Obama said that,
18 he also said that in the interim we're going to maintain
19 a secure and reliable stockpile. And towards that end,
20 the Obama administration has specifically endorsed and
21 given lots of money to the CMRR nuclear facility.

22 But getting to mission need, what -- what
23 the Obama administration has not done nor has the Bush
24 administration done, despite repeated attempts, it has
25 not raised the level of plutonium pit production from

1 the currently sanctioned level of 20 pits per year. And
2 I don't think there are any immediate prospects that
3 that rate of production will be raised.

4 And nobody should be under any illusions.
5 The CMRR, it's not only about but it is primarily about
6 expanding pit production, despite denials in the
7 Supplemental EIS. I can point you to a number of other
8 NNSA documents, such as the Fiscal Year '11 Strategic
9 Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan, such as a
10 solicitation for a bid to manage the Lawrence Livermore
11 Laboratory, which has specifically tied expanded pit
12 production to new design reliable replacement warheads.

13 Now, I know I'm going to run out of time,
14 and I'm hoping I'll get another chance to speak. But I
15 think it's illustrative and important to look at the
16 history of the pit production since 1989. And in that
17 year, the FBI raided Rocky Flats. And Rocky had -- its
18 peak was probably capable of -- don't hold this for a
19 fact, but it was probably capable of producing on the
20 order of 1000 pits per year. Well, the FBI raid just
21 shut that cold.

22 And then the Department of Energy spent,
23 oh, the next 15 years or so trying to re-establish
24 interim pit production here at Los Alamos. And the
25 purported reason or rationale for doing that was to

1 produce the particular type of pit for the W88 warhead
2 that was being produced when Rocky was shut down.

3 Well, subsequently, LANL has done its
4 production run for about 30 W88 pits; completed it last
5 year. I don't believe it's going to be producing any
6 more W88 pits, and it's not clear why any other pits
7 would be needed. There are approximately seven other
8 types of pits.

9 This goes back. I don't think the
10 laboratory -- the labs and the Nuclear Weapons Complex,
11 in general, I don't think they have entirely given up on
12 new designed weapons, and they're doing it by another
13 name. And they're seeking to incrementally achieve
14 their aims through these so-called life extension
15 programs, which they're going to take existing weapons
16 and radically modify them. So I'm still waiting for the
17 red sign to come up.

18 But to conclude for now: Again, it's the
19 aim of the Weapons Complex to radically change existing
20 weapons, to change their military capabilities, in fact.
21 And they will begin intrusive modification of existing
22 pits up at PF4, the existing pit production facility,
23 which will be integrated into the CMRR nuclear facility.
24 And I'll continue my remarks later.

25 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. MacALLISTER: David Bacon, followed by
3 Leslie Alderwick.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: David will be back
5 later. He has to give a radio show.

6 MR. MacALLISTER: Okay. Leslie Alderwick?
7 Forgive me if I'm mispronouncing that name.

8 MS. ALDERWICK: Hi.

9 I guess I'm a little confused. I was
10 sitting in a restaurant in Taos, and I picked up the
11 Journal, and it said something about a meeting down here
12 about this issue. But nowhere in the paper did it say
13 that this new building -- 6 billion, is it? A
14 \$6 billion building, when we have no money for
15 education, is going -- nowhere did it say it's going to
16 build detonating devices for nuclear bombs. Nowhere did
17 it say that. Why not? Why not? Why isn't this room
18 filled with people trying to make it clear that life is
19 really more important. You've got intelligence. You're
20 educated. We have brilliant minds here; poetry. And
21 we're going to build more nuclear bombs? Come on. It
22 is time that everybody gets on the same page.

23 Do you like your life? Do you enjoy
24 breathing air? Do you love your children? And we're
25 going to build more bombs? Let's get that information

1 out into the public. Shouldn't we? It's not in the
2 public view. These newspaper reports don't tell you
3 what's really going on. Why don't you tell us the
4 truth? Why isn't the truth out there? If it's okay and
5 building all these bombs is a good thing, why don't you
6 tell us you're doing it?

7 I think we need a little more truth. With
8 all this intelligence and all this poetry, how about a
9 little truth? How about a little belief in life instead
10 of money and all the things that war brings?

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you.

13 Pamela Gilchrist, followed by Erwin Rivera.

14 MS. GILCHRIST: I'm Pamela Gilchrist, and I
15 live in Santa Fe.

16 In addition to the previous comments, most
17 of which I fully agree with, I want to emphasize that
18 the Department of Energy must consider what I believe to
19 be the only viable alternative, and that is to abandon
20 this project.

21 (Applause.)

22 MS. GILCHRIST: Cleanup of the existing
23 waste -- cleanup of the existing waste must be a DOE
24 priority, not a new nuclear facility, on which
25 450- to \$500 million has been spent.

1 Although I'm speaking as a private citizen
2 tonight, I served on the Northern New Mexico Citizens'
3 Advisory Board to the DOE for the cleanup at LANL. I've
4 served on the board for two years, and I'm familiar with
5 the current cleanup effort. I feel that the DOE can be
6 proud of the dedicated team doing this critical work.

7 DOE has made a commitment to cleaning up
8 the legacy waste at LANL when it signed the consent
9 order of the New Mexico Environment Department on March
10 1st, 2005. The order requires cleanup by December 31st,
11 2015, including Area G dump site at Technical Area 54.
12 However, cleanup is proceeding there at only 25 percent
13 of capacity, and the only constraint is money, a mere
14 \$400 million, not even as much as has been spent on the
15 studies for the \$6 billion facility. \$400 million is
16 needed for the cleanup to be done at 100 percent
17 capacity. To avoid the NMED fines, cleanup at 100
18 percent capacity needs to happen to meet the 2015
19 consent order deadline. We've done the math. So in
20 order to meet the consent order deadline of 2015, DOE's
21 cleanup operation at LANL needs to run at 100 percent;
22 currently running at 25 percent. They can do it. They
23 just need the funding. DOE must comply with consent
24 order, not build a new nuclear facility.

25 (Applause.)

1 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you.

2 Erwin Rivera, followed by Annal Hansen.

3 MR. RIVERA: David Bacon has arrived, if
4 you care to go with him.

5 MR. MacALLISTER: Well, what I'm doing with
6 people who are out of the room, I will call them; they
7 won't lose their turn, but we'll stay in the order.
8 Thank you for --

9 MR. RIVERA: (Speaking Spanish; no
10 translation.)

11 And I'm bilingual or multilingual. I wish
12 I could speak in the language of my Taos ancestors or in
13 Tewa, but I hope I speak with some common sense and
14 convey to you the prayer of our ancestors.

15 I speak mostly also as a grandfather and my
16 responsibility to them, because as I was taught, whether
17 I'm a Chicano from land grants or an Indio from Taos
18 Pueblo, that we understand that what we do, say today
19 will have an impact upon seven generations unborn. My
20 grandmother has held my grandchildren, meaning there are
21 five living generations in my family. But that still
22 means I have a responsibility to my grandchildren's
23 grandchildren, to account for the shame and neglect that
24 our generation has allowed to happen, to be there at
25 that end [sic], their inheritance.

1 I'm not here to debate the scientific
2 information but merely to say it's not dependable. It
3 can't be held accountable. And the only consistency,
4 beginning from when the Los Alamos Laboratories started,
5 began at gunpoint when my children's ancestors were
6 forced off of the Pajarito Plateau at gunpoint in the
7 name of the national security with the promise that
8 first rights of rescission would go back to those first
9 descendants of that land, and they lied.

10 There is no credibility by DOE or LANL, no
11 proven accountability, and so whatever is said in any of
12 the reports paid for by immoral money cannot be trusted.
13 But what I do trust is the conviction of people that can
14 speak truth to power and stand up to the corruption that
15 Los Alamos is merely one example of.

16 Those homesteaders that were removed by
17 force, then bought off by silence in the settlement that
18 was made of several million dollars, hidden in a
19 military appropriation, thanks to Plutonium Pete
20 Domenici. Their story of injustice is yet to be told.
21 But \$7 million isn't enough to hide the truth of the
22 injustice or what happened to the Pueblos, because we
23 know the power of the Jemez, which holds the largest
24 caldera, volcanic crater, on earth, and with many sacred
25 sites that also were desecrated from the very beginning

1 that those laboratories began.

2 Then we had the Cerro Grande Fire and more
3 sacred sites revealed, and illegal dumping that is
4 beyond the records and the memory and the accountability
5 of Los Alamos to admit to. And they want us to trust
6 their technology? I don't, because technology over
7 common sense -- Cerro Grande -- all you had to do was
8 see if the wind was blowing (demonstrating).

9 To tie this to the rest of the
10 technological solutions of nuclear energy, nuclear
11 power, nuclear terrorism, we have been victims at every
12 aspect of the nuclear chain in Nuevo Mexico, beginning
13 from the national sacrifice area of the Jackpile Mine
14 and highest birth defects on earth of the Laguna Pueblo
15 people, and that nothing will grow there and that people
16 cannot grow their corn, which is primary to all our
17 prayers.

18 But in the promise of jobs as the Vaseline
19 for what was to come, to all the way to WIPP, and all's
20 they can come up with their technology is another
21 landfill just built a little deeper. And nuclear energy
22 and the promise for nuclear and energy independence is
23 just another fancy way of boiling water. What's the
24 technological gift?

25 I also need to speak with a promise of the

1 time that we know we are in. We are in the time of
2 prophecy in the native way. So I please ask -- this is
3 not comments for your applause. So that none of the
4 sacredness of what needs to reach your heart is shaken
5 off of you. We are in the time of prophecy, and Aztecs
6 call this time Iztsolin [phonetic], time of earth
7 movement.

8 Our young people are fulfilling prophecy
9 because they want to return, and they're asking to learn
10 the old prayers. Our younger generation's prepared to
11 sacrifice by fasting for the good of the people, and
12 they will have a memory to hold us accountable to what
13 we have done or not done by our neglect to assure future
14 generations.

15 The drilling into the geothermal pools,
16 what we have heard from experts about seismic activity,
17 only correlates what our ancestors have told us of their
18 warnings of what we are attempting and what risk that we
19 have placed upon all of us.

20 So my last message is to the highest
21 concentration of Ph.D.'s on the face of the earth so
22 that you can face your children in the eye: Convert
23 that intelligence and that education for life and for
24 peace so that we can look each other in the eye as
25 hermanos -- (speaking Spanish; no translation) -- and

1 have a future that will -- (unintelligible).

2 Thank you.

3 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you.

4 Annal Hansen, followed by John Withan.

5 And pardon me if I'm mispronounced your
6 name. Correct me.

7 MS. HANSEN: My name is Annal Hansen.

8 In 2000, I was chair of Concerned Citizens
9 for Nuclear Safety during the Cerro Grande Fire. After
10 that, we organized a conference called the Cerro Grande
11 Fire and the Aftermath. We requested cleanup of
12 Los Alamos. It -- still, ten years later, nothing has
13 been done. It is only being done by a consent order.
14 Los Alamos Labs and Los Alamos National Security now
15 will not do anything to take care of the citizens of
16 New Mexico in the future, because -- unless they are
17 taken to court. They do not care about our lives. Our
18 lives are not a value to them.

19 President Obama said, when he was running
20 for president, that he wanted a nuclear-free world. If
21 so, why are we building more pit? We do not need any
22 more nuclear weapons. We do not have the money to build
23 the new building, and we do not need any more bombs.
24 This project must be abandoned.

25 Nuclear power, nuclear energy, nuclear

1 weapons is deadly from the beginning to the end, from
2 uranium mining that killed our native people, who have
3 been the miners, to the end product, which is death. A
4 bomb is to kill. Nuclear power plants kill people now.
5 They are not made for peace.

6 We need green jobs, really clean green
7 jobs.

8 I am also extremely concerned that this
9 planned pit production, bomb building, is being built
10 upon our water supply, which right below where the
11 building is being built is the major water diversion
12 plant for the City of Santa Fe. All of that water also
13 goes downstream. We already have plutonium in the
14 Rio Grande. It is a fact, a documented fact. Lake
15 Cochiti was built to stop the plutonium from going into
16 Albuquerque. So we have a real serious problem with
17 plutonium already in the water stream, not to mention
18 all of the toxins and the chemicals that are created by
19 the process of making nuclear weapons.

20 And 60 years ago, when they built the lab,
21 they said, Oh, don't worry; it'll take 600 years before
22 we -- you see any contamination; there will never be any
23 contamination. It's only taken 50 years or less to have
24 contaminated springs along the Rio Grande. So there is
25 absolutely no reason to build this kind of building.

1 The financial costs of trying to build a
2 plutonium pit production complex in a geological
3 unstable area are just too high. A new nuclear facility
4 will detract from cleanup of the existing mess, and we
5 must make sure that the legacy waste that is running
6 into the Rio Grande every time there is a large water
7 event or a snow event -- they had to create the Buckman
8 Diversion with doors so that they could close the doors
9 in order -- when there was a runoff from Los Alamos so
10 that that water would not be going into our drinking
11 system. So that is just one small example of the damage
12 that is being done to all of us through this.

13 The U.S. does not need 80 new plutonium
14 pits a year. We don't need any. We need to move away
15 from killing, and we need to have life-affirming
16 activities. And manufacturing of plutonium pit is a
17 dangerous and polluting threat to the health and safety
18 of those living downwind and downstream. So please be
19 considerate of the world, and stop the nuclear menace.

20 (Applause.)

21 MR. MacALLISTER: Our next speaker is John
22 Withan, followed by Jack Franco.

23 MR. WITHAN: I'd like to yield my time to
24 Jay Coghlan.

25 MR. MacALLISTER: Jay.

1 MR. COGHLAN: Jay Coghlan, Nuclear Watch.

2 When I was last talking, I was trying to
3 trace the history of plutonium pit production from 1989.

4 And briefly, Rocky Flats was making on the
5 order of 1000 pits. The FBI raided it; shut it down.
6 W88 pits were in production at that time.

7 Interim production was re-established at
8 Los Alamos, but in, like, 2002 or 2003, NNSA was coming
9 forward with a proposal for a modern pit facility,
10 capable of building 450 pits per year. And in Part 3 of
11 the NEPA processes like this, that was defeated, and
12 Congress declined to fund it.

13 NNSA came back with a proposal for a
14 consolidated plutonium center, and that was to produce
15 125 pits per year. And that got defeated as well. NNSA
16 came back proposing to expand pit production to 80 pits
17 per year. This was in 2006, if I remember correctly.
18 But that, too, was defeated.

19 What I'm trying to depict is the overall
20 trend where this country is going down from producing
21 1000 pits per year to under 20. In this particular
22 year, I don't believe that Los Alamos is producing any
23 pits whatsoever or pits certified to go to the
24 stockpile. And as I previously said LANL did a
25 production run of approximately 30 pits for the W88

1 warhead, which met their strategic needs. So there is
2 no apparent reason for future pit production, save one.

3 And up until 2006, NNSA was claiming that
4 pits had a lifetime -- serviceable lifetimes of around
5 45 years. And Senator Bingaman, at our request, asked
6 NNSA and some independent experts to perform a pit
7 lifetime study. And the pertinent conclusion is that
8 pits last a century or more. So they're known to be
9 relatively stable.

10 Again, underlying the fact that there is no
11 clear need for plutonium pit production, save one, and
12 so the past argument was over the so-called reliability
13 of pits. We beat them at that argument. In response,
14 NNSA has come back and used what I'm going to derive as
15 being an apple and motherhood argument of: Now we have
16 to have absolute surety in our weapons. And surety
17 means preventing the unauthorized use by anybody else.

18 Now, that sounds like a great idea, and I'm
19 all for that. But the problem is, I believe this is
20 being used as a rationale for intrusive modifications at
21 Los Alamos. And there can be -- this could actually
22 undermine our national security, because a pit has to
23 pretty much perfectly, symmetrically implode in order to
24 reach criticality, and anything that can possibly
25 perturb that perfect implosion could affect the

1 performance of the stockpile.

2 Now, let me be clear: I want a future
3 world free of nuclear weapons, just like our president
4 professes and most countries around the world profess.
5 But in the meanwhile, I don't want any excuse for the
6 weaponeers to be messing with existing weapons that are
7 known to be highly reliable, and I think much of this
8 smacks as being make-work.

9 Now, before I get cut off, I just spent all
10 that time undermining the need for the nuclear facility,
11 which is explicitly for expanded pit production.
12 There's no ifs, ands and buts about it.

13 My second criticism of this Supplemental
14 EIS is that it offers no real, genuine spectrum of
15 alternatives. What it posits, or three [sic], which is
16 the so-called "No Action" to build a nuclear facility as
17 proposed in 2004, that's a nonstarter. We know that --
18 you know, that can't happen because of the new seismic
19 data and knowledge.

20 The third alternative, continuing to
21 operate the old CMR building without upgrades, is also a
22 nonstarter. We just know that operations cannot be
23 continued there without serious upgrades. And, you
24 know, should I ascribe malicious motive here? I don't
25 know. I shouldn't do that. But basically three

1 alternatives are positive, and two of them are
2 automatically straw man, as far as I'm concerned,
3 leaving just the preferred alternative paragraph, which
4 suggests that we should have at least two other credible
5 and reasonable alternatives, which I submit that the
6 National Environmental Policy Act requires that there be
7 credible, reasonable alternatives.

8 One is to look, again, at upgrading the old
9 CMR building such that necessary operations can be
10 continued in the interim. And I should point out that
11 in the past, CMR upgrades were rejected because they
12 were too expensive. Well, now that the CMR Replacement
13 Project has exploded tenfold to 6 billion, that argument
14 no longer holds water.

15 Thirty seconds. And I can suggest the
16 other credible alternative, and this is the one that
17 Nuclear Watch prefers and advocates. We do not think
18 that the nuclear facility should be built at all. We
19 think that old CMR missions can be relocated to the
20 recently constructed rad lab, which is 108,000 square
21 feet, and to the existing pit production facility, PF4.

22 And I'll close there, since Bruce is
23 getting anxious. But in sum, we'd argue, NNSA has to go
24 back and revisit mission in need and gets -- and needs
25 to present a credible spectrum of real alternatives.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

(Applause.)

SANTA FE OFFICE
119 East Marcy, Suite 110
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 989-4949
FAX (505) 820-6349

**BEAN
& ASSOCIATES, Inc.**
PROFESSIONAL COURT
REPORTING SERVICE

MAIN OFFICE
201 Third NW, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 843-9494
FAX (505) 843-9492
1-800-669-9492
e-mail: info@litsupport.com

1 MR. MacALLISTER: Jack Frenkel, and he
2 will be followed by David McCoy because Liz Rando
3 has yielded her time to Mr. McCoy.

4 MR. JACK FRENKEL: Mr. Chair, members of
5 the public, I am Jack Frenkel. I live in Santa Fe.
6 I am a physician and scientist.

7 I came mainly to listen and to hear, and I
8 want to summarize many of the uncertainties and the
9 lack of trust expressed during these previous hours.
10 So the uncertainties expressed and the mistrust
11 expressed relate to the safety in terms of water
12 supply for Santa Fe and for Albuquerque.

13 The problem of the fire danger, similar to
14 the Cerro Grande fire or a worse one, is perhaps not
15 very intense right now since most of the fire has
16 destroyed the forest. But the remaining trees, I
17 believe, will have to be removed and regrowth would
18 have to be prevented.

19 Thirdly, this seismic activity is not
20 satisfactorily presented and discussed. Fourthly,
21 the capacity to defend this large store of plutonium
22 against terrorists, particularly as much as mock
23 attacks in previous years, the mock attackers, I was
24 told, were generally prevailing and the defense was
25 inadequate. So the building should be constructed

1 in a way to make it safer.

2 And fifthly, I think there should be a
3 continuous means of updating and renewing the
4 certification of the safety of the installation,
5 because as we have seen in the Japanese disaster,
6 new problems, unforeseen problems constantly arise
7 and they have to be incorporated.

8 Inasmuch as this is the safety planning
9 stage, I think it is the most important time to
10 handle this matter now to the best possible degree.

11 I am in favor of construction of the
12 laboratory, only -- let me emphasize only -- so that
13 scientists can do their function in a safe and
14 efficient way since the old building is probably too
15 inadequate to work very much longer without
16 curtailing activities.

17 By no means, however, should this be a
18 reason for increasing weapons production, which all
19 indications are we have adequate numbers right now.
20 We actually are reducing them in the recent
21 agreement with Russia. So there is no reason to
22 produce more weapons. Our general tendency should
23 be one of decrease of the weapons.

24 So finally let me emphasize that we need
25 to increase the certainty of safety and increase the

1 amount of trust that we convey to the general
2 public. Thank you.

3 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir. Thank
4 you, sir. (Applause)

5 David McCoy followed by Doug Doran.

6 MR. DAVID McCOY: Well, you have heard a
7 lot of statements that indicate that the truth has
8 not come out and that there has been serious damage
9 to the environment for many years. How many of you
10 people out there -- raise your hands, too -- feel
11 that this is really a criminal enterprise which we
12 have undergone?

13 Well, it seems that a lot of the DOE
14 personnel have left, so at the next major meeting, I
15 would suggest that the citizens get together and
16 make a citizens' arrest of those people and have
17 them thrown in jail. It would certainly make a
18 statement that would echo around the world.

19 Now, I was speaking earlier about some of
20 the problems of Kappa. You know, the site they have
21 chosen is on soft volcanic ash, and it's going to
22 shake like a bowl full of jelly, only in this case,
23 you are not going to be shaking jelly or jello. You
24 are going to be shaking plutonium, a lot of it.

25 Now, they need to know what the value of

1 the Kappa is. That's the energy that comes up from
2 deep in the earth and goes through these different
3 layers, okay, and that's how much shaking you are
4 going to get on these volcanic tufts, and it's going
5 to be focused up on this mesa.

6 Now, they just did a study in California,
7 Volume 26, No. 4, November 2010, "Earthquake
8 Spectra, Professional Journal of the Earthquake
9 Engineering Research Institute." We all know how
10 famous California is.

11 They say other areas of bedrock, including
12 the Santa Susanna and much of the Santa Monica
13 Mountains and the Palos Verdes, Puente, and San
14 Joaquin Hills are underlaid by sandstone and shale.
15 Amplification in these areas results in shaking
16 potential up to 75 percent more than firm rock. So
17 when you have an earthquake at this particular
18 location -- and you can have simultaneous faults
19 earthquaking there, as Mr. Gilkeson explained -- you
20 can have a much increased level of shaking because
21 of that soft volcanic ash.

22 Now let's talk about how they determined
23 Kappa. This is in the Updated Probabilistic Seismic
24 Hazard Analysis from 2007 which they tout as
25 resolving those problems. Listen to the language.

1 I am an attorney, and I always look at language. I
2 look at language for whether it's certain language
3 or whether it's uncertain language. Does it connote
4 risk? Does it connote that we are safe?

5 Now, listen to some of this stuff. For
6 the new analysis, both segmented and unsegmented
7 rupture models were considered for the Pajarito
8 fault system, favoring the latter which is
9 characterized by a 367 kilometer long floating
10 earthquake rupture source. Floating earthquake
11 rupture source, in other words, this thing just kind
12 of floats around. We don't know where it's located.
13 The preferred range at maximum earthquakes is for
14 moment magnitude, 6.5 to 7.3. 7.3 is a whopper of
15 an earthquake, and it's three times as strong as one
16 of their other reports says they can have there.

17 In addition to the dominant Pajarito
18 fault, 55 additional fault sources were included in
19 the PSHA. Three aerial earthquake source zones were
20 defined based on seismotectonic provinces in the
21 LANL region: The Rio Grande rift, southern Great
22 Plains, and Colorado plateau.

23 Well, are these faults that we are talking
24 about up by Los Alamos related to the Rio Grande
25 rift? Just how big an earthquake can we have in

1 this region, folks? I don't think we really know.

2 Because the epistemic -- oh, I love that
3 word. That means you don't know what you don't
4 know, so you just kind of go ahead anyhow -- because
5 the epistemic variability was deemed insufficient as
6 provided by the five attenuation relationships, they
7 were all scaled to obtain a total sigma. In other
8 words, they used computer modeling without real
9 data.

10 They say, because any one seismic event
11 was recorded at only a few sites -- and they didn't
12 know if those few sites were actually explosions
13 that happened or actually seismic events -- there
14 was considerable uncertainty in their computed
15 distances and depths, as well as measured
16 amplitudes, uncertainty in the reliability of
17 instrumental calibrations, full inversions to
18 estimate Kappa and stress drop were not successful.

19 To compensate for the lack of
20 region-specific attenuation relationships, the
21 well-known Stochastic Ground Modeling Approach was
22 used. Again, modeling. We don't have the data so
23 what do we do? We model.

24 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir.

25 (Applause)

1 Doug Doran followed by Louise Baum.

2 MR. DOUG DORAN: Doug Doran. Thank you.
3 Thanks to everyone.

4 How to make a target. The long-term plan
5 is to make the local culture work for its own
6 extermination. The plutonium factory will push the
7 plan a long way down this path toward the ultimate
8 goal. This is the sociopathic doctrine known as,
9 "Manifest Destiny," supremacy of the white race.

10 Now, awareness of this is evident
11 throughout the workforce at both LANL and Sandia,
12 and that awareness poses by far -- by far the most
13 serious threat to national security. In fact,
14 awareness is the threat of threats, because it could
15 cause projects guided by this Saurian doctrine to
16 backfire. This explains the trouble and the faulty
17 analysis that Greg caught.

18 I understand C.G. Jung said there are many
19 people who are only partially conscious. Even among
20 absolutely civilized Europeans, there is a
21 disproportionately high number of abnormally
22 unconscious individuals who spend a great part of
23 their lives in an unconscious state. They know what
24 happens to them, but they do not know what they do
25 or say. They cannot judge of the consequences of

1 their actions. These are people who are abnormally
2 unconscious, that is, in a primitive state.

3 What then finally makes them conscious?
4 If they get a slap in the face, then they become
5 conscious. Something really happens, and that makes
6 them conscious. They meet with something fatal, and
7 then they suddenly realize what they are doing.

8 When it comes to LANL, I go up and down.
9 I want them to shut it down and clean it up.

10 (Applause)

11 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir.

12 Louise Baum followed by Elana Sue St.
13 Pierre.

14 MS. LOUISE BAUM: Hello. I noticed when I
15 came in a lot of very kind of sharp looking men with
16 name tags. I kind of feel for you. I realize
17 probably your careers, your livelihoods are caught
18 up in having this building built. But I also know
19 that you are all human beings. Probably many of you
20 have children. You have bodies that are affected by
21 radiation.

22 I think these are very intense times. A
23 lot is going on now that they we thought was
24 unthinkable. We really did not think that what has
25 happened to Japan was a possibility. Obviously they

1 didn't think either that it was a possibility.

2 I think there is something called common
3 sense and there is something called honor, and I
4 feel as an American, I felt my country had both
5 those qualities. But this project is telling me
6 that it is really lacking. I mean, it's so clear
7 that if you look at Japan, you know the unthinkable
8 happens. You know people have not had enough
9 imagination and enough commonsense to look at all
10 the possibilities.

11 There was a tsunami. The backup
12 generators failed because of the water. The
13 earthquake affected things. All these things
14 happened. This means millions of people in Japan
15 have been radiated. The whole globe on the northern
16 hemisphere is full of radioactive toxic clouds.
17 It's coming down on all of us. It has gone
18 completely around the planet.

19 This is the time to shut down activities
20 that involve radiation. It's quite clear. It's
21 commonsense. Let's look at it. Let's act on
22 commonsense instead of our wishes for things to go
23 back to a normal that really never existed.

24 It's not normal to be building weapons
25 that can kill everyone on the planet. It does not

1 make sense. It's also not honorable to have a
2 process in which you are constantly circumventing it
3 and not living up to the rules. There was an awful
4 lot of talk when I came in this room about the
5 rules, about if someone talked long, they were going
6 to be thrown out. They were going to stop the whole
7 process.

8 You know, you have not followed the rules
9 that have been put in place by DOE, that have been
10 put in place by the Congress. You are not being
11 honorable and you are not being honest. It is not
12 right, and it also is very dangerous for all of us,
13 for everyone here.

14 The thing we realize in Japan and we
15 realize really in Chernobyl, because people in
16 England were told not to nurse their babies after
17 Chernobyl went off. This is not local. It is
18 affecting us more if we have an earthquake, which is
19 a huge possibility. If we have another fire like
20 Cerro Grande, it's going to affect us more here, but
21 it affects the whole globe. It affects the whole
22 human race and every living thing -- the air, the
23 water, everything. Does this make sense? It does
24 not make sense.

25 Let's make sense. Let's go back to

1 commonsense. It's really simple. I mean, you look
2 like a very intelligent man, but what about the
3 commonsense in this.

4 I know this project has immense amount of
5 momentum. It's carrying a lot of people's careers
6 and hopes. I really felt for the people who came up
7 and talked about how we need construction jobs.
8 Well, we do, but there are so many things we could
9 construct. We could keep people working. We could
10 make our education systems much better with this
11 money. This is not a reasonable or sensible thing
12 to do, period. Let's stop it. (Applause)

13 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, ma'am.

14 Elana Sue St. Pierre followed by Shannyn
15 Sollitt, because Jan Lustig yielded her time to you.

16 MS. ELANA SUE ST. PIERRE: I would like to
17 thank everybody for being here.

18 My name is Elana Sue St. Pierre. I am an
19 occupational therapist providing home-based therapy
20 for our community's most medically fragile infants.
21 I am a spokesperson for Healthy Water Now, ASAP,
22 representing over 300 parents with children with
23 special needs, therapists, doctors, nurses, doulas,
24 midwives, and child educators.

25 I speak for the children whose voices will

1 hold everybody here accountable in days yet to come.
2 The nuclear footprints of this nation's first weapon
3 of mass destruction lies hidden in secret files,
4 documents, and nuclear waste buried in the canyons
5 between Los Alamos and the Rio Grande, this
6 community's major source of water. Less than a
7 hundred yards from the intake of this community's
8 water supplies lies traces of plutonium and
9 radioactive heavy metals buried only three feet deep
10 within the Buckman well field and along the banks of
11 Rio Grande.

12 Current radioactive clean-up standards and
13 methods for radioactive clean-up do not protect us,
14 they do not protect pregnant women and children.
15 These silent yet deadly nuclear footprints may be
16 seeping into our life-giving limited water supplies,
17 becoming waters within the wombs, birthing lives
18 plagued by deformity, sickness, and death.

19 The air we breathe, the soil that grows
20 our food radiates background contamination from
21 these nuclear bombs, nuclear footprints of the
22 nuclear age threatening our national security as
23 well as the health and safety of this downwind, down
24 river, downstream community.

25 We intend that all funding for this bomb

1 factory be redirected toward remediation of nuclear
2 contamination that already threatens us. We intend
3 there be reevaluation that prevents any nuclear bomb
4 factory from being created in this water-scarce,
5 seismographically active region.

6 A few years back, the Pecos River flowed
7 backwards due to an earthquake. The Valles Caldera
8 was created when this planet's largest mountaintop
9 was blown to bits by the earth quaking. And we all
10 quake to think that our world's best scientists
11 would plan to store over 13,000 pounds of plutonium
12 in this unstable area. We ask that the billions of
13 dollars earmarked for this disastrous plan be
14 redirected for bio remediation and alternative
15 research.

16 We would like to hold a moment of silence
17 for contemplation in prayer to honor and to give
18 power to the voiceless victims of the nuclear age
19 and that the weapons of mass destruction have
20 already created over the generations.

21 My father, a World War II veteran, always
22 told me I would not be alive if the bomb had not
23 been dropped. He was ready to be shipped out to the
24 front lines and would most likely have been killed.
25 He felt I owed my life to those that made the bomb.

1 And so I stand here today, and I say, "Gracias,
2 adios."

3 For today the kamikaze fighters have
4 abandoned their planes, Hitler's bones have turned
5 to dust, and the race to create a bigger and better
6 gadget -- what they called the first bomb, the
7 gadget -- it no longer serves a national defense
8 purpose. It rather creates potential national
9 disaster.

10 Germany leads the way away from nuclear
11 energy and self-destruction. Japan is in a state of
12 nuclear disaster realizing there is no safe place.
13 Where the laws of nature rule, earthquake and
14 nuclear stockpiles equate disaster.

15 The potential to transform and transmute
16 the power of destruction into life sustaining
17 technology lives in the hearts and the minds and
18 consciousness of all of us here. To vision
19 alternatives which protect innocent women and
20 children is why I come here to this hearing. This
21 silence we will hold carries the screams for help
22 from the hearts and the wombs of our future. As we
23 touch our hearts together from this place of
24 silence, all answers can unite us beyond our dreams.
25 And I will hold silence and ask that you hold

1 silence.

2 (A moment of silence was observed.)

3 MS. ST. PIERRE: Thank you.

4 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you.

5 Shannyn Sollitt followed by Adele
6 Caruthers.

7 MS. SHANNYN SOLLITT: Thank you, Elana,
8 for those poignant thoughts and words. And thank
9 you all for coming.

10 My name is Shannyn Sollitt. I am a
11 citizen of Santa Fe, New Mexico. I have been
12 positing the idea of the Los Alamos Peace Project to
13 transform the laboratories of weapons of mass
14 destruction into institutions that engage only in
15 life affirming research and development. For more
16 than a decade, I have just been putting it in the
17 ethers.

18 And this is not the first time these
19 hearings have been held about this very subject.
20 Why do you need to keep coming back to find out
21 whether the citizens of northern New Mexico approve
22 of this bomb factory at Los Alamos labs? Do you
23 think that people's opinions have changed? Do you
24 think that anything has changed?

25 LANL still sits atop a windswept mountain

1 in a seismic zone where wildflowers and contaminated
2 runoff continue to threaten and compromise the
3 health and well-being of millions who live downwind
4 and downstream. Where does the government get the
5 right to exert this form of cruel authority over the
6 people here who repeatedly, year after year, have to
7 leave their fields of endeavor and take the time to
8 defend their communities against this form of
9 tyranny?

10 Citizens have repeatedly spoken out and
11 submitted written testimony to defend our rights to
12 have air and water free from the horrible
13 radionuclide contamination created by the lab, and
14 you blithely want to create more. No. Our opinions
15 do not change, and clearly our voices have not been
16 heard, or you would not keep returning over and over
17 just to test us to see if you have worn down the
18 opposition of the citizenry of New Mexico.

19 These hearings are an exercise in futility
20 that pretend to affirm that we still live in a
21 democratic country. But you are not fooling us.
22 These hearings have always been a sham and this
23 hearing is a sham. Nuclear bombs are immoral. They
24 are a vulgar and heinous crime against planet earth
25 and humanity. The only worse crime against humanity

1 would be the actual utilization of them.

2 Their very existence goes against the very
3 tenets of freedom and prevention of tyranny that our
4 founding fathers designed the constitution to
5 protect us against, and those who perpetuate this
6 crime are tyrants, despots, and traders to the
7 constitution.

8 Please tell us how will this proposed
9 factory protect the inalienable rights of US
10 citizens to life, liberty, and the pursuit of
11 happiness.

12 You may respond that the very existence of
13 these weapons prevent war, and for that reason we
14 must continue the proliferation of our nuclear
15 arsenal. But since the inception of the nuclear
16 bomb, the United States of America has been waging
17 wars in at least 18 countries -- Korea, Guatemala,
18 Cuba, Indonesia, Congo, Peru, Laos, Vietnam,
19 Cambodia, Lebanon, Grenada, Libya, El Salvador,
20 Nicaragua, Panama, Bosnia, Afghanistan, Iraq, and we
21 fund wars and channel arms to Columbia, Mexico, and
22 Israel.

23 The United States has been far and away
24 the world leader in the development of weapons of
25 mass destruction, and the existence of these weapons

1 by our country holds the rest of the world in fear,
2 has been the cause of nuclear proliferation, has
3 shredded the fabric of global potentials for
4 cooperative security that the whole rest of the
5 world is yearning for. Let us call a spade a spade.

6 This plan to spend 180 billion over the
7 next decade to modernize the nuclear weapons
8 complex, this CMRR complex is being created to line
9 the pockets of military contractors in bed with the
10 legislators in Washington. So you traitors to the
11 US constitution who have led us down the road to a
12 failed democracy, you are out of compliance with the
13 Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the Strategic Arms
14 Reduction Treaty. Traitors, cease and desist.

15 (Applause)

16 MR. MacALLISTER: Adele Caruthers followed
17 by Dominique Mazeaud.

18 MS. ADELE CARUTHERS: I am Adele
19 Caruthers. I am an occupational therapist and a
20 member of the Peace and Justice Committee of St.
21 Bede's.

22 I do hope that you folks are listening,
23 because what I heard tonight I will never forget.
24 And I just have to say I moved here from the Boston
25 area 20 years ago because of the beauty and the

1 clean air and the just amazing state of New Mexico,
2 and now I just can't believe what I am hearing, what
3 is happening.

4 I feel like I am standing on a train
5 track, and the train is coming full speed ahead. So
6 how do I stop it? I can just learn what is the
7 truth. I am trying to figure that out. Do you know
8 what is the truth? Are you telling us the truth?

9 Six hundred billion for plutonium; is that
10 right? Six hundred billion --

11 VOICES FROM THE FLOOR: Six.

12 MS. CARUTHERS: Six billion, okay. And we
13 cannot afford to pay our teachers. Now we are
14 closing schools and doubling up. So as far as the
15 money is concerned, we have to think about the
16 budget of the country.

17 We are asking other nations to disarm and
18 pretending like we want to be nonnuclear, as Obama
19 said, and what are we doing? We are doing exactly
20 the opposite. Pretending, isn't that hypocritical
21 for us to pretend and then do the exact opposite?

22 There are three things -- and I will be
23 very brief -- but there are three things that I am
24 thinking about, and one of them is the cost, the
25 cost of building weapons. The second one is the

1 safety, which everyone has mentioned with the
2 earthquake prone site, and the third is the morality
3 of contaminating our beautiful land, our water, our
4 air, and Santa Fe, to contaminate our own life, our
5 planet. That's all I want to say. Okay.

6 (Applause)

7 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, ma'am.

8 Dominique Mazeaud followed by Joni Arends.

9 MS. ARENDS: I want to give my time to Bob
10 Gilkeson.

11 MS. DOMINIQUE MAZEAUD: I am going to be
12 very brief, Joni, so I can give my time.

13 I am Dominique Mazeaud from Santa Fe and
14 before that from Europe. And I wouldn't be here
15 without the goodness of America. I was brought up
16 by a family, a father especially who kept talking
17 about the arms of goodness of America. And this is
18 why my destiny brought me here, and now I have been
19 in Santa Fe for 24 years, before in New York.

20 And as I have been living here, I have
21 discovered the arms of goodness of America are not
22 so good. Now the arms are what we are talking about
23 this evening, and I am just -- you know, my friends,
24 people here have talked statistics and facts, and
25 I'm not going to repeat them. But I want people to

1 remember, to me, as a new American, I really believe
2 in the soul of this country. This is why I am here
3 and I have stayed here all these years, but as I am
4 staying here, my heart is broken, because I really
5 feel the soul of America is being very compromised
6 by these arms that she is making. Thank you.

7 (Applause)

8 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you.

9 Joni Arends followed by Mitch Buszek.

10 MS. JONI ARENDS: Good evening. My name
11 is Joni Arends. I am with Concerned Citizens for
12 Nuclear Safety.

13 I just want to provide some information
14 about this project. For the construction alone, the
15 laboratory is proposing to use about 4.6 million
16 gallons per year of water in order to mix the
17 concrete. That's about 11-acre feet per year. You
18 could water a lot, irrigate a lot of farmland with
19 11-acre feet a year.

20 For operations, they are proposing to use
21 16 million gallons per year, which is about 49-acre
22 feet per year. And it's really about choice, isn't
23 it, about how we are going to use our limited
24 resources, the limited water that's available.

25 Another matter is that the Los Alamos

1 County and the lab own 1,200-acre feet of San Juan,
2 Chama water. They haven't diverted any of that
3 water yet, but the county has made a proposal to the
4 Buckman board to be able to use the diversion site
5 and run a pipeline across the river and lift the
6 water about a thousand feet up to the White Rock
7 water treatment facility.

8 I think it's important for people in Santa
9 Fe to know that. It's under consideration right
10 now. There are engineering studies being done. I
11 don't think our intention in Santa Fe for the
12 diversion project was necessarily to provide
13 facilities for Los Alamos County and the laboratory
14 to use the Buckman diversion project to obtain
15 water.

16 This has been a very difficult process
17 these last four days, and I think Scott and I have
18 attended all four hearings. Each night the rules
19 have changed a little bit. The rules have been
20 tweaked a little bit. And it's not like the recent
21 hearings.

22 The hearings that are held by the
23 laboratory are much different than those that are
24 run by DOE headquarters, and DOE headquarters runs
25 hearings across the country for Programmatic

1 Environmental Impact Statement under the National
2 Environmental Impact Statement. And basically when
3 headquarters is running a hearing, we know what to
4 expect. We know there is going to be a court
5 reporter. We know they are going to record the
6 hearing. We know there is going to be a podium.
7 There is going to be a microphone. We are going to
8 be able to hear one another speak, because we learn
9 and we find solidarity amongst ourselves.

10 But this whole adventure with this
11 proposal for the nuclear facility has been very,
12 very difficult. Even from the first scoping meeting
13 in White Rock, where if you wanted to make comments,
14 you had to go into another room and nobody else
15 could hear you speak, and that there were poster
16 sessions and we couldn't hear each other speak.

17 And NEPA, as Doug says, our voices empower
18 NEPA, and we need to be able to hear one another.
19 And many of us have been in these rooms for 10, 20,
20 30 years. And especially for the LANL proposals, it
21 would seem that the laboratory would know who we
22 are. And what our concerns are. As Shannyn said,
23 you know, we have opposed this project for years,
24 these proposals to expand the pit production.

25 And by not providing us with consistency

1 under the National Environmental Policy Act of what
2 we can expect, it's really disheartening. And I
3 hope that through this process, the laboratories,
4 the Tonys, the Rodgers, the Johns, the Beths could
5 put together a manual that mimics what happens at
6 headquarters for these NEPA processes, and that it
7 would be available on the web so that people can
8 know what to expect.

9 This whole thing about seven minutes in
10 Los Alamos, three minutes in Albuquerque, five
11 minutes in Española, and maybe we will get five
12 minutes here in Santa Fe tonight, it's getting very
13 old. We are very knowledgeable. We are a very
14 knowledgeable community -- I know. I have one more
15 sentence -- we are a very knowledgeable community.
16 We have been successful through this process.

17 And we have to continue doing what we are
18 doing, and we need to continue to speak truth to
19 power. Thank you all for coming. (Applause)

20 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you.

21 Mitch Buszek followed by Eric Wilson.
22 Pardon me if I mispronounced it.

23 MR. MITCH BUSZEK: That's pretty good.
24 It's Buszek like music, but close enough.

25 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you.

1 MR. BUSZEK: My name is Mitch Buszek. I
2 come here as a parent of a 22-year-old daughter. I
3 come as a veteran. I actually am a veteran for
4 peace if you can imagine such a thing. We have
5 quite a few of them here, and I have been involved
6 in this nuclear mystery since I met Joni about 22
7 years ago.

8 I would like to thank some people for what
9 they are doing and what they have done, and I would
10 like to thank you for being here. This probably
11 isn't the most delightful evening of the month. I
12 would like to thank some people. Irwin was kind
13 enough to talk about lineages and generations, and
14 there are some people here that have really put
15 their heart and soul into educating us about this
16 issue and advocating for us.

17 Previous speaker Joni Arends has been a
18 real beacon of light for a lot of us, and Holly
19 Beaumont, who has done a thing or two here in the
20 last few years.

21 Shannyn Sollitt, thank you for your work.

22 Dr. Jack Frenkel, I don't know you, but
23 you sound like you have been at it for a while.

24 Jay Coghlan and the gentleman over here --
25 I didn't catch your name, but it sounded like you

1 have been around this stuff for a while.

2 MR. DAVID McCOY: David McCoy.

3 MR. BUSZEK: David McCoy, thank you for
4 being here.

5 I would like to make a suggestion. My
6 sense of most of the speakers that I managed to hear
7 tonight were addressing things like values and what
8 is important to them personally and what is
9 important to the community. We have talked about
10 environment and health and safety. And I got a
11 little talking to, as I talked to a couple of
12 gentlemen out in the hall, and it's like the budget
13 for this thing has been approved by Congress.

14 VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: No.

15 MR. BUSZEK: It hasn't been? Okay.
16 Straighten me out on that. But they are proceeding
17 as though it's funded. Is that accurate? Okay.

18 And I would like to suggest that the two
19 most important people in this room to hear what we
20 have to say are the representatives of our
21 Congressional staff. We have a young lady here from
22 Congressman Ben Ray Lujan's office. Is that you,
23 Solidad? What is your name?

24 MS. JENNIFER CATECHIS: Jennifer.

25 MR. BUSZEK: Jennifer. And I think we

1 have a representative from Senator Udall's office;
2 is that accurate? What is your name?

3 MS. MICHELLE JAQUEZ-ORTIZ: My name is
4 Michelle, and our office has been in all the
5 meetings. We have been advocating very hard behind
6 the scenes for some of what Joe, me, and Jay are
7 pushing.

8 MR. BUSZEK: I really appreciate what some
9 of our representatives have done. The two
10 represented here tonight have really done the work.

11 I would like to suggest that the forum
12 that would most suit us is a forum with Congressman
13 Lujan, with Senator Udall, and with Senator Bingaman
14 so that we can articulate to our elected
15 representatives how we would like to spend our
16 federal money and our tax money.

17 To take another step in that direction, we
18 have got a very skilled moderator in the audience.
19 Lorraine Nells back there in the back row is a
20 talented TV interviewer and talk show host. I think
21 we have the skill in this room to fill up both of
22 these rooms and talk about the things that we care
23 about and things that we value.

24 And I think these guys, oh, boy, I think
25 it's a difficult thing. I mean, they are here to do

1 a job. They are doing it as conscientiously and
2 honestly as they can, but our values are just miles
3 apart. And I think it's incumbent on us to pick the
4 right people to talk to, and I think if we could get
5 a forum with our representatives, that's really who
6 needs to hear our pleas for help.

7 I think that's all I have to say. Thank
8 you very much. (Applause)

9 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir.

10 Ma'am, can I ask the representative from
11 Senator Udall's office to restate her name. The
12 court reporter wasn't able to catch your name, and
13 we would like to have it since you spoke from the
14 audience.

15 MS. MICHELLE JAQUEZ-ORTIZ: Do you want me
16 to state it out loud or do you want me to go up
17 there?

18 MR. MacALLISTER: If you will just state
19 it, I will restate it for you.

20 MS. JAQUEZ-ORTIZ: It's Michelle
21 Jaquez-Ortiz. It's like Jaque with a z at the end,
22 dash, Ortiz. I am the senator's northern New Mexico
23 field representative. I was at the Los Alamos
24 meeting, the Española meeting to the end, by the
25 way, last night. It ended very late. And then we

1 had Bill Wald at the Albuquerque meeting.

2 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, ma'am.

3 MS. JAQUEZ-ORTIZ: We also weighed in on
4 the Taos meeting as well.

5 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, ma'am.

6 Our next speaker is Eric Wilson followed
7 by Sam Hitt.

8 MR. ERIC WILSON: My name is Eric Wilson,
9 and I think I want to tell a little bit of a story
10 today, because everyone has so many more facts than
11 I really do. But I have opinions, and the story is
12 about when I was a kid, and I had a fish. I got a
13 fish for my birthday in a little round bowl, and I
14 really liked that fish. It was really cool.

15 One day I decided it would be really cool
16 so that the first thing you saw when you came into
17 the house, and we put that fish bowl right on the
18 very end of the stairway banister. We had a nice
19 little round place there, and I put it there. My
20 mom told me we couldn't keep it there. I was like,
21 well, it was great there. I showed her. I set it
22 there and it stayed there and it didn't fall off.
23 It was very safe there, I thought. She said, you
24 know, you don't understand. It's just not safe
25 there.

1 One day when she was away, I put it back
2 there. My friends came over. We were rough housing
3 around again. Sure enough, it fell right off and
4 smashed on the floor. The fish didn't do so well.
5 The whole thing went to hell.

6 And I guess I kind of see this project in
7 the same way. People are saying that it's safe,
8 people believe it's safe, but I think the
9 information isn't really there.

10 The story goes on a little bit, because
11 then I started asking my mom like, you know, if I
12 could get another one. And she was like, well, you
13 know, you could get another one, but it was your
14 fault that it got destroyed. She goes how about
15 this, instead of going to -- there was a great place
16 called Story Town that we went to every year.
17 Instead of the trip to Story Town, we will get you
18 another one.

19 Well, I didn't really want another fish as
20 much as I wanted to go to Story Town, so I didn't go
21 for that. I think that's also kind of the same
22 thing. We are having conversations in Congress this
23 week about what we had to cut out of our budget in
24 order to be able to send disaster relief to Joplin,
25 Missouri, where they are suffering. I never thought

1 that conversation would ever have happened in our
2 country. We would always take care of people like
3 that.

4 But in a time when we are having that kind
5 of conversation, I think we need to look at our
6 priorities. Should we be looking to spend this kind
7 of money on this kind of project, or are there more
8 important priorities for us at this point in time?
9 I think without question, if you ask every person in
10 the country what their priority is, building more
11 nuclear weapons or taking care of disaster relief
12 and educating our children and converting to a
13 sustainable economy, I think overwhelmingly people
14 would say, yes, of course.

15 But that's not really the point. The real
16 point here is: What are we trying to do? We are
17 trying to make more nuclear weapons. We are talking
18 about not just like we need them immediately, but we
19 are building a facility that won't even be doing it
20 for a long time, investing a lot of resources in
21 that, because somehow we believe that in the
22 long-term, in the future, we are still going to need
23 nuclear weapons. And for what?

24 I mean, I really thought at some point --
25 a long time ago I had a lot of hope in our country

1 as I was growing up, because it really seemed like
2 we were moving in a good direction. I thought that
3 once we used nuclear weapons, that we really had
4 learned our lesson. We were going to move away from
5 that.

6 Instead now, at a time when we have no --
7 I mean, I don't know if we are expecting these are
8 going to be useful against some theoretical opponent
9 that's going to come from outer space. I really
10 don't see what the point is. Who wins with a
11 nuclear weapon? Who wins when even one nuclear bomb
12 ever goes off for any reason? Nobody really wins.

13 I really think there are three things we
14 really need to think about. One is, this is crazy.
15 Just, I mean, most people when I talk to them about
16 it, they say, well, what's it for? And when I say
17 just to build more nuclear weapons, they are like, I
18 didn't think we were still doing that. I thought we
19 were dismantling our arsenals.

20 But then when you get it back to the
21 amount of money that's involved. Take it back to,
22 even if it were a great idea and we are at the peak
23 of our economy, we had all the resources in the
24 world, why in the world would we stick it on that
25 banister where it's so likely that there is a

1 problem. If we had to, if we really had a need for
2 nuclear weapons and we had to build them, why in the
3 world would we choose this place to do it? It just
4 doesn't make any sense from the very top to the
5 bottom.

6 So I really hope we can stop this. I hope
7 there is a real reason for this hearing, that this
8 hearing is really an opportunity, well, everybody
9 here was against it. Okay, here we go. We are not
10 going to do it. I suspect that's not the case. So
11 I hope -- I hope our congressional representatives
12 not only go back there and fight for this, but make
13 sure that the awareness is there for the whole
14 congressional delegation, that if you want to save
15 money, here is a great place to start. (Applause)

16 MR. MacALLISTER: Sam Hitt followed by
17 Reverend Holly Beaumont.

18 MR. SAM HITT: Thank you very much. My
19 name is Sam Hitt, and I am a concerned citizen with
20 a long time interest in the NEPA process.

21 Just to remind us all, that NEPA is the
22 charter for the protection of our environment passed
23 in 1969. It's really the software that we have in
24 our democracy to avoid tragic mistakes, to make
25 informed decisions, and to create a future for our

1 children that is long-term and sustainable.

2 And key to the implementation of NEPA, as
3 contained in the implementing regulations, is this
4 phrase that I think everyone should keep in mind,
5 that public involvement will occur, shall occur, to
6 the fullest extent possible. This is legal
7 language, to the fullest extent possible.

8 Now, to me that means not a highly managed
9 process like we are having tonight, where we are
10 limited to five minutes to make our dog and pony
11 show. No, no. It's when we sit down with the
12 drafters of this document, with the people who are
13 putting together this project, who are making key
14 decisions every day, and discuss and sit at the
15 table with and have access to the information that
16 is behind the words, so we really can be informed
17 citizens, so we really can exercise this function of
18 directing our democracy, of not just being pawns and
19 not just being little cogs in the machine, but
20 actual actors with a great deal of power.

21 I have reviewed somewhat the Supplemental
22 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, as in most
23 cases, there is an emphasis on the direct impacts,
24 but there is very, very little discussion of the
25 indirect impacts or the cumulative impacts. These

1 are key to the environmental consequences that have
2 to be evaluated. So I would urge that this document
3 be reformatted, and that every time there is an
4 issue, cumulative indirect impacts are discussed, as
5 many other agencies do in their NEPA process, so the
6 public really has a chance to evaluate, particularly
7 the cumulative impacts.

8 Now, we can't just rely on local
9 government and state agencies and others to respond
10 to letters and inquiries about what they think the
11 cumulative impacts would be. No, no. We have to,
12 the laboratory and citizens have to go out and seek
13 out that information. We can't just be passive
14 recipients, and I did not see that in the current
15 document.

16 Also key to me is the evaluation of
17 alternatives. There are three alternatives being
18 evaluated in this case. I think a very reasonable
19 alternative would be to look in detail at abandoning
20 the current structure and not building the new
21 structure. That's more than just no action, which
22 is required by the regulations. That's actually an
23 affirmative alternative that would implement, I
24 think, what would be desired by most taxpayers in
25 this country and, of course, many people in this

1 room.

2 So I think that's about it. Thank you
3 very much. (Applause)

4 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 MR. MacALLISTER: Reverend Holly Beaumont,
2 followed by Rebecca Ortega.

3 REVEREND BEAUMONT: Good evening.

4 I'd like to start this evening by thanking
5 Nuclear Watch and Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety
6 and also Cultural Energy. I don't know if we have
7 written checks recently for these organizations, but I
8 think it's one of the best ways you can invest in
9 helping us to create the kind of community that we hope
10 to achieve, by doing more than just this. These
11 organizations really need money.

12 I also want to thank all of you for being
13 here. I know there was a debate going on about whether
14 we were wasting our time or not, and I was reminded at
15 an event earlier today that was held by Department of
16 African-American Affairs, a quote from Martin Luther
17 King, Jr.: "Our lives begin to end the day we become
18 silent about things that matter." So thank you for
19 being here.

20 In 2006, Los Alamos National Laboratory
21 became a stunning example of privatization of public
22 property when the Bush administration handed it over to
23 Bechtel. The lab's historic record of patriotic service
24 to this country, however misguided, was replaced by a
25 maniacal, insatiable drive for profits.

1 So who is Bechtel? Well, I've been using
2 this as an opportunity. I clearly am opposed to the
3 project, but I'm increasingly concerned to learn about
4 our new neighbors. I call them -- well, I call them
5 "Bechtel on the Hill." That's one of the friendlier
6 names. But who are these people?

7 Bechtel Enterprises is headquartered in
8 San Francisco and is a privately held firm and the
9 world's largest engineering construction company. There
10 are just -- oh, Bechtel estimates that it has built 40
11 percent of U.S. nuclear capacity and 50 percent of
12 nuclear power plants in a developing country. God bless
13 them. Bechtel received a ten-year contract in December
14 2000 with the U.S. Department of Energy to design, build
15 and start up waste treatment facilities at Hanford that
16 will transform liquid radioactive waste into a stable
17 glass form, a process known as vitrification. And I'm
18 just beginning to learn about this, but it's scary.
19 These are just a few -- these are a few more of the
20 notable Bechtel projects.

21 Bechtel built the San Onofre, California
22 Nuclear Plant on a major earthquake fault line, and
23 installed the seismic braces backward, meaning the
24 braces will increase the impact of an earthquake rather
25 than reduce it. Good work.

1 Bechtel has also been sued by former
2 employees of the plant for exposure to radiation.

3 Three Mile Island cleanup. Bechtel was
4 invested [sic] by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, who
5 found that -- was investigated by the Nuclear Regulatory
6 Commission, who found that Bechtel -- I quote --
7 "improperly classified modifications to the plant as not
8 important to safety in order to avoid safety controls."
9 In 1985, the NRC fined Bechtel for harassing and
10 intimidating workers who complained about these lapses.

11 The Radioactive Campaign reports that their
12 sampling efforts along the Hanford Reach of the Columbia
13 River, begun in 1983 with Greenpeace, has revealed
14 evidence of Hanford's still secret production of
15 uranium-233 for many nuclear battlefield weapons.

16 In 2001, TRAC found that 60 percent of the
17 Hanford Reach and seven out of ten major salmon spawning
18 grounds were contaminated with by-products from U-233
19 production.

20 In 2002, TRAC discovered a previously
21 unreported discharge pipe that may have been used to
22 discharge radioactive waste directly into the Columbia
23 River.

24 Now, I wanted to say something about water,
25 based on Joni's concerns -- raising those concerns.

1 Through subsidiaries and joint ventures in
2 the U.S., Europe and, infamously, in South America,
3 Bechtel was also involved with over 200 water and
4 wastewater treatment plants; the privatization of water
5 in Cochabamba, Bolivia resulting in exorbitant water
6 prices, as much as 1- to 300 percent increase. Mass
7 demonstrations in Bolivia in opposition to the water
8 system eventually forced the reversal of the contract,
9 and then Bechtel attempted to sue Bolivia, an
10 impoverished nation, for \$50 million because they were
11 losing \$30 million in profits they spent cleaning up
12 what was left behind by the previous owner. \$30 million
13 is, for Bechtel, one half of their daily profits.

14 I will close.

15 If the CMRR is, in fact, necessary to our
16 national security, then it is far too important and, in
17 light of Fukushima, potentially far too dangerous to be
18 entrusted to a corporation like Bechtel, with your [sic]
19 abysmal, indeed criminal record of environmental
20 degradation, human rights abuses, cost overruns at
21 taxpayers expense and the privatization of community
22 commodities -- public commodities.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. MacALLISTER: Rebecca Ortega, and then
25 I will begin calling people who had stepped out or who

1 had yielded their time.

2 MS. ORTEGA: (Greeting in Native American
3 language; no translation.)

4 It is with respect that I come here today.
5 My name is Rebecca Ortega, and I am from the Pueblo of
6 Santa Clara. I'm a tribal member from Santa Clara
7 Pueblo.

8 Our pueblo sits directly downwind from
9 Los Alamos, and, you know, it's really, really sad that
10 all of this stuff that's going on at Los Alamos is
11 contaminating the water, the air, the land.

12 And on top of that, Bechtel, which the
13 young lady just mentioned, is here -- it's a for-profit
14 organization. They're not here for us. They're not
15 here to give us jobs. They might say, Yes, we're coming
16 to bring you jobs. But guess what kind of jobs?
17 They're giving us janitorial, secretarial, all the
18 low-end jobs. I know for a fact that they are bringing
19 their own top people that they're paying top dollar,
20 \$300,000 a year, \$200,000 a year, you know. They're
21 bringing their own people.

22 But why do we live in New Mexico? Why do
23 so many people come to New Mexico? Because they love
24 New Mexico; because it's beautiful; it's clean. You
25 know, we have a lot of culture here. It's peaceful.

1 But guess what? If we don't stand up to what's going to
2 be coming up in Los Alamos -- it doesn't matter if it's
3 scheduled for 5 years or 10 years or 15 years. If we
4 don't stand up for it, our children and grandchildren
5 and our great-grandchildren will not enjoy the same kind
6 of life and beauty that we are living in right now. And
7 it's going to be our fault.

8 Yes, I know a lot of people say, Well, you
9 know what, you can go there and talk against whatever
10 the government wants, but you know what, I had to come
11 today to say how I feel and what's in my heart and what
12 I see. Because if I don't -- yes, maybe Los Alamos
13 Labs -- maybe they're still going to do what they want,
14 because just look at what they're doing to us right now.
15 The government -- the government does whatever they
16 want.

17 If they want to raise the prices to us for
18 \$3.73 a gallon, \$4.00 a gallon in some places -- I went
19 up to TA for jury duty about two, three weeks ago:
20 \$4.05 a gallon up in Chama.

21 Now, then about two, three weeks ago, I'm
22 watching World News, Diane Sawyer. Diane Sawyer says,
23 Well, you know what, Exxon, Chevron and all these oil
24 companies have already, the first quarter, made a \$32
25 billion profit. And guess what? On the backs of all of

1 us Americans.

2 If this was happening in some other
3 country, wouldn't we be the first ones to say, Why are
4 those poor people losing their houses? Why are people
5 being thrown out, in foreclosures? Why are they being
6 charged exorbitant prices for food? Why are they being
7 charged exorbitant prices for gas? You know, I'm just
8 wondering about all those kind of things.

9 And like I said, I am from the Pueblo of
10 Santa Clara. I am from Santa Clara Pueblo. And the sad
11 thing is that -- we have to live together. We live
12 together, what, 2-, 3,000 people. The reason we live
13 together is because that is the way we can maintain our
14 traditions, our culture, our dances, our language. We
15 cannot -- we cannot go away and try to get together and,
16 oh, yeah, you know what, we're going to have a corn
17 dance today; oh, yeah, we're going to have this dance
18 today. How can we? That's why we live together,
19 because we come together; we practice our dances; we
20 practice our songs, our traditions, our culture, our
21 language.

22 If -- and which I'm saying probably not
23 even if, but when all of our land, our water and our air
24 is contaminated, where are we going to go? What city,
25 what state is going to accept 2-, 3,000 Native Americans

1 to come there to live together to continue the culture?
2 It isn't. And what's going to happen? It's another
3 form of let's get rid of those Indians. Terminate, you
4 know. This has been going on for a lifetime, and this
5 is just another form. Except this time, it's not just
6 going to be the Native Americans that are going to be
7 driven away from their homelands. It's going to be
8 everyone else that's in this room that came here from
9 somewhere else because they wanted to live in peace and
10 beauty. You know, it's just really sad.

11 And not only that, look what happened in
12 Japan. Did we not learn from that? Did we not learn
13 from that? That is just crazy.

14 You know, I just feel like in the next few
15 years, when our land is contaminated, what are we going
16 to tell our children, our grandchildren when they have
17 major health problems, when there is no clean water,
18 when there is no clean air, no clean land? And the
19 government's going to say, Hey, guess what, your land is
20 condemned; you have to move away from there. Like I
21 said, where are we going to go? They'll tell us, You're
22 on your own, buddy.

23 You know what, we have no money. We have
24 no money for health care even for us now. But guess
25 what? Congress has the best money [sic] for themselves,

1 but what about for the rest of us? Nothing.

2 MR. MacALLISTER: Your time is up, ma'am.

3 MS. ORTEGA: Okay. One more sentence.

4 MR. MacALLISTER: Sure.

5 MS. ORTEGA: I absolutely do not want to
6 see any more plutonium labs built up in Los Alamos. We
7 have to have respect for life. We have to have respect
8 for each other. We have to have respect for our
9 children. We have to have respect for our mother earth.
10 And we have to have respect most of all for what our
11 Lord God has given us, and he has given us this planet
12 to cherish, to use and respect.

13 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, ma'am.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, ma'am.

16 I will cycle back through the people who
17 may have stepped out or they may not be here or people
18 who have yielded the floor in the order in which I had
19 originally called them.

20 The first person I'm calling is Jennifer
21 Sequeira. Is Jennifer here?

22 The next person is Bridjette Kennedy? Is
23 Ms. Kennedy here?

24 MS. KENNEDY: I had deferred my time to
25 Robert Gilchrist.

1 MR. MacALLISTER: Yes. And we're now
2 through everybody, so if you want to speak now, you're
3 welcome to.

4 MS. KENNEDY: Okay. Yeah. Thanks for
5 coming to speak your heart for -- for the love of this
6 beautiful place. And a social responsibility of money
7 is a good one. Jobs for a peaceful economy is better
8 than to proliferate wartime, the nuclear and military
9 industrial complex. Over 50 percent of our tax-paying
10 money goes there, and it's -- it's a very powerful thing
11 to come up against and say that it's wrong.

12 My father was involved with the nuclear
13 industrial -- military industrial complex, being
14 involved with engineering intercontinental ballistic
15 missiles, radio tracking devices and Star Wars. And I
16 give thanks to my father, who recently died, to teach me
17 the importance of the social responsibility and how you
18 earn your living. So I became a landscape architect,
19 thinking I love the planet and I want to make it whole
20 and beautiful again and help heal the planet.

21 And so the first job that I was given was
22 the design -- being involved in the design of a military
23 base for the nuclear weapons on submarines, a military
24 support base in Kings Bay, Georgia. And so I told them,
25 Yeah, this is a great landscape architecture office, but

1 I have to quit because I believe in social
2 responsibility.

3 And, you know, my dad did it because he
4 wanted to put us through college. Money is important,
5 but social responsibility means living the truth of your
6 conviction of life-affirming processes. And I hope that
7 we have a future in this world to have a peaceful
8 society where love and helping others is a priority and
9 destruction and pollution and hazardous waste and --

10 The peacemakers of the Hau de no sau nee
11 people created the first democracy in America. And his
12 premise is to bury all weapons under the Sacred Tree of
13 Life and let those roots grow in four directions for the
14 seventh generations, as well as Hau de no sau nee
15 premise that was -- that the peacemakers spread the word
16 of peace in Upstate New York. And I hope -- I hope for
17 a future of peace and burying all weapons and letting
18 that grow in the four directions. And this is a great
19 place to start right here, where we live in the shadow
20 of -- of a defunct nuclear and military industrial
21 complex.

22 Thanks.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. MacALLISTER: David Bacon.

25 MR. BACON: The fact that I've only heard

1 two other people from Santa Clara, but I think if we had
2 maybe 25 more out, we could win this thing tomorrow.
3 It's got to be a very impressive community.

4 We heard from Marian Naranjo and her
5 grandson from Espanola, and it was a powerful --
6 empowering testimony.

7 I think that part of the difference we're
8 seeing tonight is some -- some fascinating struggle that
9 I see, having been to the Espanola, Albuquerque and then
10 this hearing. And there is a tremendous struggle going
11 on here that we don't really see very clearly. The labs
12 are involved only, basically, in massive -- the most
13 massive violence and brutality imaginable to man.

14 I have a prayer here from -- Chatral
15 Rinpoche's is a 90-something-year-old lama now. And I'm
16 not going to read it, but I have it out back for those
17 of you who are interested. And in it, he prays for the
18 end of this demon war, this violence that goes so far
19 beyond anything that any of us could imagine as simple
20 human beings. And yet within this struggle, we have
21 these voices that we're hearing from our community that
22 are so powerful, so clear, so right down the line in
23 terms of truth, truth at every level, the spiritual
24 level, the emotional level, the data level. It's an
25 astonishing and wonderful thing to see.

1 And I was thinking of the difference
2 between the terms "power" and "empowerment," and the
3 labs do not empower. They hold power over. They hold
4 power over us, over the planet.

5 A nuclear weapon is simply the most violent
6 form of power that anyone could hold over anything on
7 this planet. As Shannon said, it's just a -- it's just a
8 massive form of tyranny, and yet our stories clash,
9 because the lab's story can never be told honestly.
10 They will never allow it to be told as an honest,
11 straightforward story, that we are only involved in the
12 destruction of all life on the planet. This is a story
13 that is too monstrous to even begin to tell.

14 So our stories -- there's a -- there's a
15 question as to. As to whether these -- these hearings
16 are legitimate, but I was telling Zubie [phonetic] of
17 the radio show, activists don't participate in
18 legitimate stuff. Activists participate against
19 illegitimate stuff. That's what we do.

20 And what I'm hearing from the activist
21 community up and down the Rio Grande, I feel maybe we
22 should tip our hat to Bechtel because I feel that what
23 Bechtel woke up in Bolivia, they're finally waking up
24 here in Northern New Mexico.

25 And what about our communities -- the

1 pueblo and communities that suffered the initial hit
2 from this thing, because there weren't many other people
3 living in the area back then? And as Erwin Rivera so
4 eloquently stated, the land grant communities on the
5 Pajarito Plateau. So it's the older communities, the
6 deeper communities that I feel are going to take -- that
7 are going to guide us now, that are going to show us
8 where we need to go. And the growth from just a few,
9 50, 60, people at these hearings who speak so
10 eloquently, I feel it's going to grow now. And I feel
11 we're seeing a movement evolve in Northern New Mexico.
12 And where I see the difference in the movement from the
13 past to now is that people are not only saying no to
14 things like the CMRR building, which is a fairly prosaic
15 argument, but they're saying yes to the life on the
16 planet and to the life of the communities that exist up
17 and down the Rio Grande now. They're saying yes to the
18 wisdom of the people. And they're saying, That money
19 that you're throwing away on nuclear rat holes belongs
20 rightly to us and has to be put to use for life now,
21 life on the planet, restoring the planet, cleaning up
22 the mess of Los Alamos and completely eliminating what
23 my good friend Kathy Sanchez calls the culture of
24 violence.

25 And she said last night, in Espanola, that

1 we're all so blown out by the culture of violence
2 because alone we hardly ever confront it as what it is.
3 Together, in rooms like this, our legitimacy can begin
4 to come forward in so many different ways that we then
5 confront the culture of violence, and it's where this is
6 going to go that I think is so exciting now and it's
7 real. This isn't make believe.

8 We have a lot of work to do, but it's
9 really the only work that we have right now. It's the
10 only legitimate work that we really have. And I feel
11 that in Northern New Mexico, we can begin to focus on
12 this issue, our bioregion, the damage done to it and the
13 political reality that can come out of healing our
14 bioregion, and it'll be wonderful.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you.

17 MR. BACON: By the way, anyone who doesn't
18 know Robin (indicating)? He's like Bodhisattva
19 reporting these meetings; Cultural Energy from Taos.

20 (Applause.)

21 MR. MacALLISTER: John Withan.

22 MR. WITHAN: John Withan with Nuclear Watch
23 New Mexico.

24 As part of an organization that's really
25 trying to do an analysis of this document, as blah as it

1 seems to be, I'd like to point out that the numerous
2 references that were cited in the document were not only
3 cited by a generic name that sometimes points to a 1400
4 page document that's a photocopy without any page
5 reference, and many of the reference documents were not
6 placed online at the time that the SEIS came out.

7 So in doing formal comments and doing
8 research for the formal comments, it makes it difficult
9 if not all the references are available, and when
10 references are cited, they are cited so generically that
11 if one cannot actually do a word search on that
12 document, it takes a vast amount of time to find what
13 that reference is. And that's all I have to say right
14 now.

15 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir.

16 Liz Rando? Liz Rando?

17 She had yielded earlier to David McCoy.

18 Liz, are you here?

19 Is there anybody who has not had a chance
20 to speak yet who would like to speak at this point?

21 Is there anybody who would like to make a
22 follow-up statement at this time?

23 And one thing, when you make your follow-up
24 statement, it's very important to give your name so that
25 the court reporter can have it, since I won't be

1 announcing people. Thank you.

2 MR. McCOY: Dave McCoy.

3 One thing I'd like to mention is, we're
4 focused on the CMRR, which is one little piece of the
5 planet. We've got 104 nuclear reactors operating.
6 There are 444-odd nuclear reactors in the whole world,
7 38 of them sited in highly dangerous seismic areas.
8 We've got White Sands, Alamogordo, Sandia Laboratories,
9 Kirtland Air Force Base. What we're doing is making
10 atomic deserts all around the planet day after day, year
11 after year.

12 An 8-million gallon jet-fuel spill at
13 Kirtland Air Force Base. They've trashed the aquifer
14 for Albuquerque. They're not really telling you how bad
15 it is.

16 568 nuclear and hazardous waste dumps
17 across Sandia Labs and Kirtland Air Force Base and
18 Albuquerque. You've got the mixed-waste landfill,
19 million and a half -- 1,500,000 cubic feet of hazardous
20 waste over Albuquerque's drinking water in unlined pits
21 and trenches. Other sites at Sandia dump billions of
22 gallons of contaminated water.

23 The NMED doesn't really look closely at
24 this.

25 You've got TA 54, Areas G, H and L up at

1 Los Alamos.

2 You think people are going to be able to
3 live on those sites? They're not. Nobody's living
4 where they exploded the first atomic bomb. Nobody's
5 living out at the Nevada Test Site, you know. We're
6 doing this all around the planet. This is like a
7 terrible, terrible cancer that's spreading. Fukushima
8 is just an example.

9 Roger Snyder, back there, he says -- I
10 mean, this guy only takes notes when you attack the NEPA
11 process or the SEIS. He doesn't care about values or
12 how heartfelt we feel about this. He's only listening
13 to NEPA arguments or arguments as to why the SEIS is not
14 an effective valid document. Okay? But you hear them
15 talk about, well, we can't change the goal of national
16 security. And why can't we? Well, because the
17 President and Joe Biden have said that we've got to have
18 this pit production. Okay?

19 Well, I submit to you that this is too much
20 power to be placed in the hands of one person or two
21 people in the first place and that we have to get to
22 President Obama and tell him that we don't want this.
23 But also the Roger Snyders and the others out there at
24 LANL have to be honest for a change and go to the
25 President and Senator Biden -- or Vice President Biden

1 now and say, Look, we don't need these. This is a
2 dangerous area. It's just going to create more
3 contamination.

4 What would the explosion of 13,000 pounds
5 of plutonium be like? I keep wondering about what that
6 would be like if that came together.

7 Now, we've got this enormously hefty
8 building that's sitting there, and they expect it to
9 float on this soft volcanic ash. Well, this is really
10 ludicrous, you know. Inside they're going to have these
11 huge tanks of water; they're supposed to suppress the
12 plutonium fire if they have one. But in an earthquake,
13 we know what happens. Equipment isn't available. Are
14 all the components and the pipes and the backup
15 generators going to be available to release this water?
16 Well, there's what you call hydro wetting, you know.
17 Once all that water might escape from the building, it
18 gets down in that volcanic ash, you're going to have --
19 you're going to have first-rate slush.

20 So the heat from all this plutonium; the
21 plutonium's got to be kept in some kind of tanks, cooled
22 with water. That's going to be an incredible weight in
23 its own right.

24 How much is this building going to weigh,
25 by the way? I never did find that number in the SEIS.

1 Write that down. We want to know what the weight of the
2 building is going to be when you finally get done with
3 it.

4 Do you know?

5 MR. KOVAC: Yes.

6 MR. McCOY: What is it?

7 MR. KOVAC: 400- -- 490 million pounds.

8 MR. McCOY: 490 million pounds. And an
9 earthquake occurring, and we don't even know what the
10 size of it potentially is.

11 I want to tell you something. I dealt with
12 Bechtel when I was 27 years old as a -- as a nuclear
13 intervenor. They wanted to expand spent fuel storage at
14 the Trojan Nuclear Reactor. And I found secret
15 documents from the state geologist that were suppressed,
16 and those documents said they could have an earthquake
17 twice what the Trojan Nuclear Power Plant was designed
18 to withstand on the Columbia River. Okay? That's
19 Bechtel.

20 You're right, Holly.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir.

23 We've got time for another speaker or so,
24 depending on how long people go. Is there somebody else
25 who would like to speak?

1 Anybody else who would like to speak?

2 All right. Then at this point, I will
3 officially close the meeting.

4 And thank you-all for your attendance, and
5 I thank many of you for your attendance multiple times.
6 Your stamina is applauded. Appreciate it.

7 (The public hearing concluded, 8:56 p.m.)

8 (5:46 p.m., non-public comment of Doug
9 Doran provided to Court Reporter Mary C.
10 Hankins.)

11 MR. DORAN: I would like to read four
12 comments written by Bob Walsh, W-A-L-S-H, of Santa Fe.
13 So I'll just read them as they're written here.

14 "I now provide" -- if I go too fast -- "I
15 now provide the following four comments on the Draft
16 Supplemental EIS.

17 "Number one: Please provide a reference to
18 an analysis that substantiates that the probability of
19 an airplane crash during overflight does not exceed ten
20 to the negative sixth/year, conservatively calculated.

21 "Number two: Please provide a rigorous,
22 independent review of this document by an independent
23 professional organization in order to increase public
24 confidence in the conclusions.

25 "Three: Please provide an unclassified

1 overview of the classified appendix omitting details but
2 including at least answers to the following questions:

3 (A) does the appendix include consideration of attacks
4 using aircraft?; (B) in determining risks from terrorist
5 attacks, does the appendix assume continued funding for
6 government agencies other than NNSA, such as the
7 Transportation Security Administration?; (C) does the
8 appendix estimate the consequences of a successful
9 terrorist attack? If so, have these potential
10 consequences been brought to the attention of the
11 President and Congress for consideration in decisions on
12 nuclear weapons policy?

13 "And four: Please provide a rigorous,
14 independent review of the classified appendix by an
15 independent professional organization with appropriate
16 clearances, and include in the SEIS an unclassified
17 summary of that assessment. Please include the identity
18 of the organization and the amount budgeted for the
19 review as an assurance that the review is independent
20 and thorough."

21 And that's all I'd like to say.

22 (Conclusion of Mr. Doran's comments, 5:48
23 p.m.)

24 (5:57 p.m., non-public comment of Lawrence
25 Quintana provided to Court Reporter Mary C.

1 Hankins.)

2 MR. QUINTANA: Lawrence G. Quintana.

3 I'm very much so in favor of the CMRR
4 Project going forward. I think that every delay is
5 wasting a lot of resources, and it's actually creating
6 large problems. The research and the development that
7 this facility can do to help mankind is unbelievable,
8 and if they'd just give it a chance, I think they can
9 get it done. These study groups that keep studying just
10 don't seem to get it together. You can't confuse the
11 facts because your mind is made up.

12 The facts are that this facility is needed.
13 The research and development needs to go forward. The
14 benefits to the public is immense, and it's proven time
15 after time. So I am very much for the CMRR going
16 forward.

17 (Conclusion of Mr. Quintana's comments,
18 5:58 p.m. and conclusion of non-public
19 comments.)
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO

2 COUNTY OF BERNALILLO

3 CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

4 I, SALLY PETERS, New Mexico Certified Court
5 Reporter No. 57, and Registered Professional Reporter,
6 and I, MARY C. HANKINS, New Mexico Certified Court
7 Reporter No. 20, and Registered Professional Reporter,
8 do hereby certify that I reported the foregoing public
9 hearing comments in stenographic shorthand and that the
10 foregoing pages are a true and correct transcript of
11 those proceedings that were reduced to printed form by
12 me to the best of my ability.

13 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither
14 employed by nor related to any of the parties or
15 attorneys in this case and that I have no interest in
16 the final disposition of this case.

17
18 _____
SALLY PETERS
Bean & Associates, Inc.
19 New Mexico CCR No. 57
20 Date of CCR Expiration: 12/31/2011

21 _____
MARY C. HANKINS
22 Bean & Associates, Inc.
23 New Mexico CCR No. 20
Date of CCR Expiration: 12/31/2011

24 (1127K) SP/MCH
25 Date taken: May 26, 2011
Proofread by: RP

SANTA FE OFFICE
119 East Marcy, Suite 110
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 989-4949
FAX (505) 820-6349

**BEAN
& ASSOCIATES, Inc.**
PROFESSIONAL COURT
REPORTING SERVICE

MAIN OFFICE
201 Third NW, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 843-9494
FAX (505) 843-9492
1-800-669-9492
e-mail: info@litsupport.com